

Col. Albert Gallatin Franklin, Jr., O16642, United States Army.
 Col. Francis Anthony Kreidel, O39553, United States Army.
 Col. Theodore Addison Weyher, O16738, United States Army.
 Col. Bertram Arthur Holtzworth, O16804, United States Army.
 Col. Olaf Helgesen Kyster, Jr., O16830, United States Army.
 Col. Martin Joseph Morin, O16911, United States Army.
 Col. David William Traub, O17110, United States Army.
 Col. William Henry Hennig, O17122, United States Army.
 Col. Garrison Barkley Coverdale, O17148, United States Army.
 Col. William Mattingly Breckinridge, O17210, United States Army.
 Col. Thomas Jahn Sands, O17521, United States Army.
 Col. Ralph Robert Mace, O17578, United States Army.
 Col. James Bernard Quill, O17673, United States Army.
 Col. Fred Winchester Sladen, Jr., O17677, United States Army.
 Col. Charles Greene Calloway, O17690, United States Army.
 Col. Herbert John Vander Heide, O17754, United States Army.
 Col. Sidney Clay Wooten, O18126, United States Army.
 Col. Walter Bernard Yeager, O29464, United States Army.
 Col. Miller Osborne Perry, O18427, United States Army.
 Col. Louis Victor Hightower, O18502, United States Army.
 Col. James Karrick Woolnough, O18709, United States Army.
 Col. Floyd Allan Hansen, O18767, United States Army.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 112]

Abbitt	Fisher	O'Brien, N. Y.
Angell	Gamble	Patman
Bailey	Harris	Perkins
Belcher	Harrison, Wyo.	Powell
Blatnik	Hart	Regan
Brooks, La.	Heller	Rhodes, Pa.
Buckley	Hiestand	Richards
Camp	Jarman	Short
Celler	Kersten, Wis.	Sikes
Chatham	Long	Steed
Church	Lucas	Sutton
Coudert	McGregor	Thompson, Tex.
Curtis, Nebr.	Mailliard	Vinson
Dague	Martin	Vursell
Dawson, Ill.	Miller, N. Y.	Weichel
Dingell	Morgan	Wheeler
Ellsworth	Norrell	Willis
Fallon	O'Brien, Mich.	Yorty

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 366 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

RECESS FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING PRESIDENT SYNGMAN RHEE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Wednesday, July 28, 1954, for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair for the purpose of receiving in a joint meeting the President of the Republic of Korea, His Excellency Syngman Rhee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9936) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9936, with Mr. ALLEN of Illinois in the chair. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose on Tuesday, the Clerk had read down to and including line 13 on page 6. If there are no amendments at this point, the Clerk will read.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask whether the rules and the precedents of the House in reference to the right of the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill to close debate are going to be followed today or whether or not those rules and precedents are going to be violated as they were day before yesterday. I just want to serve notice that if they are I shall make a point of order and, if I am overruled, I shall appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to state that he will follow the rules of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, White House Police
 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, White House Police," \$62,000, to be derived by transfer from such appropriations contained in the Treasury Department Appropriation Act, 1955, as the Secretary of the Treasury may designate.

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DORN of New York: On page 7, after line 19, insert:

"Bureau of the Mint: For a medal for Irving Berlin as authorized by law, \$1,500."

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN of New York. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, there is no question in the minds of the committee about the propriety and timeliness of this amendment. This medal is authorized by law. There should be no delay in appropriating the necessary funds. The committee is agreeable to this amendment and is prepared to accept it.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN of New York. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, in behalf of the minority members of the Appropriations Committee, including the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Treasury-Post Office Departments which is concerned with this particular matter, I should like to say that we have no objection to the proposed amendment and that we accept it.

We feel that Irving Berlin has done more over the years for the good of this country through his writing and composing of songs than many of our sages and philosophers. An immigrant to the United States from Russia at the age of 5, his God Bless America will live the life of this Nation.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, as the ranking minority member of the subcommittee to which this appropriation

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 22, 1954

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in these days of crisis and ordeal may we be blessed with that divine insight and inspiration which will make us capable of the noblest thoughts and the most courageous actions.

Help us to understand that we cannot remain strong and steadfast amid all the pressures of fear and frustration, of cynicism and doubt, of self-seeking and personal aggrandizement that are continually playing upon us unless we have a vivid and vital sense of Thy presence and power.

Grant that we may be sensitive and attentive to the guidance of Thy Spirit as we seek to know what kind of legislation will be most helpful in lifting mankind to new and higher levels of peace and happiness.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

would be referred, I take pleasure in supporting it. Irving Berlin is a great American and one of the outstanding song writers of all time. His tuneful melodies have made his name immortal and his patriotic songs have been an inspiration to our Nation during the stress and strain of this war-torn country. God Bless America will remain in the hearts and on the lips of our people as long as there is an America. This medal will be a well merited recognition of the contribution of Irving Berlin to our national life.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN of New York. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to compliment the gentleman on his very timely amendment honoring a great American who has made such an outstanding contribution to our cultural heritage in music which has become folk music, and calling this matter to our attention in this very splendid way.

Also, I should like to express my appreciation of the action of the subcommittee; but especially I should like to compliment my colleague from New York.

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Members for accepting this amendment. I appreciate the comments that have been made on both sides of the aisle.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DORN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Surveys and planning for hospital construction

For payments to States for surveys and planning activities pursuant to title VI of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, \$2,000,000: *Provided*, That such funds shall not be available after June 30, 1956.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 9, immediately after line 8, insert "For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau, \$165,000."

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, the problem of juvenile delinquency has grown to such proportions that it is not possible for us to set it aside as unnecessary in the matter of Federal interest; \$165,000 added to the Children's Bureau fund would make possible the necessary additional personnel with which to give the advice and the encouragement to the different States which has proved of such potency in other programs.

On June 18 the President requested a supplemental appropriation for the Children's Bureau. Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind this body that the only future any country has is its children.

Significant developments in the field of juvenile delinquency, since the Bureau budget estimate for 1955 was under review last fall, led to the request for this supplemental appropriation.

The facts brought to light by the subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee appointed to investigate juvenile

delinquency point to the urgent need for more national leadership in this field. The statistics for 1953, which have just become available, show that the delinquency is continuing to rise in appalling proportions. The number of delinquent children coming from the juvenile courts in 1953 totaled about 435,000. This figure is an all-time high, and my understanding is that the 1954 figure is mounting even higher.

For 2 years the Bureau has had to rely on help from a privately financed project to carry forward work with communities in improving services for juvenile delinquents. The funds for this project will be exhausted in the very near future. It is for this reason that it is particularly important that this money be added to the Children's Bureau fund.

You see, the Bureau operates under two laws: The act of 1912, creating the Bureau, gave it broad responsibilities "to investigate and report upon all matters pertaining to the welfare of children and child life among all classes of our people." Under title V of the Social Security Act of 1935, as amended, the Bureau has responsibility for administering grants to States for maternal and child health, crippled children, and child welfare services. Under these two laws, the Bureau has responsibility for providing a wide variety of services requiring a diversity of professional personnel. The Bureau cannot expand further its works in the field of juvenile delinquency without additional funds. It has had to absorb increases of salary, which means a reduction in force of 5 more people—from 229 to 224. Should further additional salary raises be made by this body, the Bureau will be so much more handicapped in what it can do.

Mr. Chairman, we vote untold millions for the protection of our natural resources, for reforestation and soil erosion and the like, what of our greatest resource and our only future—our children? The time has come to declare all-out war on juvenile delinquency. If you will read the committee report, I am sure you will feel it is important to add this \$165,000—so little money for so great a work—to this appropriation.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I think at this time we ought to set a limit on debate on this amendment. I suggest that there be 1 more speech for 5 minutes in favor of the amendment, and 2 speeches against it—which would provide an equal division of the time on the amendment and which would be fair. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent with that in mind that the debate be limited to an additional 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, when the appropriation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was before us, I offered exactly this amendment, which the gentleman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON] is offering today. I am delighted she has seen fit to offer it, and it is quite appropriate

that a lady of such distinction, who has children of her own should offer an amendment of this type. I would like to call our attention to a matter of the record in respect to this amendment, which I strongly urge upon the House. When I brought it up originally, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY], who is chairman of the subcommittee handling that particular appropriation bill said, and I quote from the RECORD of that day's debate at page 8008, as follows:

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, we are all in accord with the objectives of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Over a month ago Dr. Eliot, head of the Children's Bureau, testified before our committee that this problem is being studied at a high level in the White House, and she thought that a supplemental request for this particular activity would be submitted to the Congress in the near future. I think we should wait until the proposition is submitted to us, because we will then have the benefit of their study and their findings. Then, we can consider their request in the regular, established manner, rather than at this time before we have any definite program to act on.

I now call the attention of the committee to the fact that by a communication from the President of the United States, House Document No. 438, he recommends that this appropriation be made though it is not included in this bill. He says as follows:

For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau, \$165,000. The additional amount is for establishment of a staff to study, gather facts, and consult with States on problems of juvenile delinquency. The purpose is to provide specialized knowledge and guidance to the States in order to aid them to improve services and facilities for dealing with delinquent children.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I want to associate myself with the gentleman. I cannot see any good reason why we should not put in this \$165,000. I do not know any more worthy cause for which we could make an appropriation than this one. I hope the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

On the last 3 days of June, over 450 specialists in the problems of delinquent children from all parts of the country—including judges, probation workers, psychiatrists, social workers, civic leaders, and others—met here in Washington on the invitation of Secretary Hobby. They met to pool their thinking about what can and must be done to curb the mounting juvenile delinquency reported in big and little cities.

With extraordinary unanimity, these experts agreed that the situation is serious. They agreed that measures must be taken both to build greater respect in youngsters for the law and to restore to

good social and emotional health youngsters who have got into trouble with the law. Over and over again, these delegates asked for leadership in meeting this problem. They can get such leadership from the Children's Bureau if it is staffed to give it.

Public and private agencies throughout the country want to push ahead, building better police services for handling young delinquents, providing better detention facilities, improving court handling, and modernizing training-school methods and facilities. Many communities are ready to go ahead in taking better measures to prevent delinquency.

Those of us who support the President's request for a supplemental appropriation are asking merely that the Federal Government increase its services for advising and consulting with States and local communities as to what are good practices, what are good facilities, and what are wise measures to take.

They can get such help from the Children's Bureau. The Bureau knows their problems, it knows what programs work efficiently, and it knows what children need if they are to have the chance to develop as responsible, socially useful, and happy human beings.

But this help can be forthcoming from the Children's Bureau only if it can add to its staff more specialists to gather essential facts, to provide guidance material, and to work with States and communities. This relatively small sum of \$165,000 would be utilized by employing men and women skilled in dealing with the many aspects of juvenile delinquency, and ready to go to work on these problems.

As we build and maintain the defenses of our Nation, let us not forget that we are making life safer and happier, not just for us adults, but for our children, and for their children. Let us not, in anxiety over the cost, make our children the casualties of our efforts to economize. We run the risk of that when we neglect to give the Children's Bureau the means for helping our States and communities do their job of building a physically, socially, and emotionally sound new generation.

Mr. Chairman, while we are on the subject of appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I should like to state that I have hoped to offer three amendments at this point. These amendments would have appropriated additional funds for cooperative research activities, for a White House Conference on Education and for the National Advisory Committee on Education. A total of \$2,025,000 was requested by the administration for these purposes, but the Appropriations Committee struck out the entire amount.

Since the President has not yet signed the three bills authorizing these activities—the conference reports were only agreed to by this body yesterday—I understand that a point of order would have been sustained against these amendments. I do feel it advisable, however, to call to the attention of my colleagues the fact that adequate appropriations for these purposes will be nec-

essary. I am confident that the Members of the other body will take appropriate action when this bill comes to them for consideration.

Mr. JAVITS. I appreciate the gentleman's support.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I would like to associate myself with the gentleman. I hope the amendment passes. All too often the technicalities presented to the Appropriations Committee blind them as to ultimate worth. On the other hand this committee must be commended on the way it has tackled the overall problem of conserving our money. The taxpayer has been saved many millions of dollars.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I wish to associate myself with the gentleman in support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio. I believe this would be money well spent. There are many millions in this bill which I think are for purposes less deserving. We must do everything we possibly can in fighting against juvenile delinquency.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I likewise want to associate myself with the program of extended help in the problem of juvenile delinquency.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman for his support.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to associate myself with the gentleman from New York, and I wish to support the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON]. I do not know of any question more important before this House at this time than the one we are deciding here.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, there is a great deal of interest in New Jersey, particularly in this appropriation for juvenile delinquency studies because, as I understand it, the special program which the Children's Bureau intends to set up has grown out of the excellent work in the field of juvenile delinquency done by a Senate subcommittee headed by the junior Senator from New Jersey, Mr. HENDRICKSON. This subcommittee has attracted to the problem of juvenile delinquency the national attention it deserves, and has brought into sharp focus the gaps in our organizational ability to

cope with what is getting to be a worse problem every year.

The trouble with this appropriation item probably is that it was too small to start with, so no one takes it seriously. If it were \$165 million instead of \$165,000, it might have had a better chance in committee.

The Appropriations Committee, in knocking out the requested \$165,000, said the Children's Bureau could find money for studying the juvenile delinquency problem by diverting it from other activities. Are we to assume that the agency got money this year from the Appropriations Committee for unnecessary activities? As the report of the committee shows, the Children's Bureau only got \$1,525,000 altogether for all of its work, and much of it is in the field of industrial health and protection.

Here is the sort of thing which puzzles me sometimes in the appropriations process: In this bill we are appropriating \$6,500,000 for forest roads and trails to enable logging outfits to get to some Government timber which is over-maturing.

Now that is all right, and probably good business on the Government's part. But the cost of just 1 mile or so of these wilderness logging roads that helps save some timber from going bad would also just about cover the cost of setting up this special staff in the Children's Bureau. I think it is a whole lot more important to save children from going bad, if that can be done with a modest appropriation like this, than to worry about the timber. Those trees may face a blight out there in Idaho and California, but I do not know of any blight worse than the human spoilage of juvenile delinquency. I think the Children's Bureau should be allowed to serve as the organizational spearhead for local, State, and National Government agencies in organizing the counterdrive against juvenile delinquency.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I, too, want to associate myself in support of the statement made by the gentleman from New York. I think the amendment is one that should be passed.

There is no question but that the fundamental cure for juvenile delinquency is a good home and good family life. This is a problem that must be handled primarily by the family and by the local community. The fact remains, however, that in many communities throughout the Nation, elements of the problem are the same, and it would be well if a coordinated effort could be made to deal with them by all such local communities.

In this respect the Federal Government can be of service, and that, I understand, to be the purpose of this amendment, namely, first, to establish a national clearing house of information on various aspects of the delinquency problem which could be made available to local groups and agencies; and, second, to provide methods for suggesting

standards and programs for training advisers and workers on a local level.

I think that for this limited purpose the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. I wish to associate myself with what the gentleman from New York has said. I know of no more important resource in this country than our children.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I shall be delighted to support the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman for her support.

There are many States that have youth commissions dealing with this subject of juvenile delinquency. Among them are: Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

This certainly is a national program. It is a very minimal expenditure which is being asked for and it is something that is recommended by the President of the United States; it is an administration program and it is certainly a desirable one.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. YATES. I just wish to point out in connection with this amendment that this will in no way affect the obligation and the responsibility of the local communities in dealing with the problem of juvenile delinquency. All this amendment proposes to do, as I understand, is to try to integrate and help local communities in operating that program.

Mr. JAVITS. That is exactly correct. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I will not take second place to any Member of this body in my concern with the problem of what is generally termed "juvenile delinquency," although I think it often should more properly be called parental delinquency. It was because of my anxiety over this problem that I introduced a narcotics bill, H. R. 8700, which provides that the sale of narcotic drugs to a minor shall be a criminal offense, punishable by death or life imprisonment.

I subscribe to everything the gentleman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON] said in the well of this House a few moments ago concerning the problem of juvenile delinquency. But, that is not the issue before the House today.

You are being asked to appropriate money to set up an agency within a bu-

reau that has had the authority to do work in this field for many years and has been doing so. When the regular appropriation bill was before the House and I made the remarks to which the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] referred, I was in hopes that the White House would appoint some commission or committee to study this problem and to present a plan for coordinating all the activities of the various agencies under one agency. I do not believe it is practical to appropriate money for this problem until such a plan is presented.

As it is to date, we have about 9 or 10 different bureaus, agencies, and departments of Government dealing with the problem of juvenile delinquency.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I will be very happy to yield in a minute.

If a study were made to coordinate the efforts of these various agencies and a program presented to the Subcommittee on Appropriations, I would be the first one not only to want to appropriate \$165,000, but I would favor appropriating 10 times that sum, in order to get the program started in the correct way, if I was convinced proper study had been given to the problem and that the recommendation was a good one. This idea of appropriating money for this purpose under these circumstances is almost similar to putting a roof on a building before you even have the plans made, let alone the foundation in. I do not believe a vote against this amendment would be a vote against correcting juvenile delinquency. I will vote against it. I refer you to the hearings held in connection with the supplemental appropriations. Dr. Eliot, for whom I have the highest respect, has not made a case for this appropriation. The strongest statement that makes any kind of a case—but which, in my judgment, is a very weak one—is the third paragraph on page 1295 of the hearings, which reads as follows:

The Juvenile Delinquency Division will collaborate with the existing Divisions of Social Services and Health Services, other constituents in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, other departments and national organizations working in this field. The Bureau through its other divisions already has many contacts with State departments of public welfare and health, and these will be utilized to further the work of the new division.

We have the Office of Education in this field, we have the Department of Agriculture in this field, we have the Department of Justice and the FBI, and we have the Department of Labor in this field. We have many more agencies, which do not come to my mind offhand, working on this so-called problem of juvenile delinquency. Why not let them get together and formulate a program and then come in here and say, "This is it; this is the amount of money we need to handle the program next year." I would be the first one to support it.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. The Children's Bureau has several of its people working on juvenile delinquency. This does not set up a different bureau. It makes it possible for the Children's Bureau to do adequate work. A vote against this amendment is not against juvenile delinquency, but it would be against the children of this country who need the coordination that only the Federal Government can give to the various work of the agencies.

Mr. BUSBEY. Again I agree with the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON] that the Federal Government should coordinate the activities in the field of juvenile delinquency; but I challenge the gentlewoman from Ohio, or anyone else, to show how the adoption of this amendment would coordinate or consolidate a single activity in this work.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it not true that the Children's Bureau has more people on this program than it did 3 years ago, yet the situation is more acute, proving that they have not gotten hold of the thing at all and that they are not the people to handle it?

Mr. BUDGE. I would say, certainly, that the appropriations to the Children's Bureau at the present time are in excess of what they were 3 years ago.

The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has raised another interesting question which the members of the subcommittee were quite concerned about when he said that this is perhaps not the right Bureau to handle this problem. There is no question about the problem being there, but in this supplemental budget request from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare we have 2 separate agencies within the 1 department, both of these agencies within the same Department asking in this budget request funds to study the very same problem. It seems to the committee, and I think it should to the Members of the House, that until the executive branch of the Government decides, at least, within just 1 department which bureau is going to make this study and make the recommendations the Appropriations Committee and the Congress would be somewhat lax in making an appropriation to a particular agency when the Department itself and the executive branch of the Government have not even concluded within the 1 department who they want to make this study.

Everyone recognizes that the problem exists, and that it is a serious one. It is one of concern in all areas of the country. For that reason, if for no other, the Congress should be satisfied that very real results will be obtained from the funds appropriated before they are provided. That is almost impossible for the Appropriations Committee and its staff to do in the limited time available

on a supplemental appropriation bill, particularly this late in the session.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, I think we should look into just what this \$165,000 is intended to cover. It is solely for hiring and for the travel expenses of 53 new people in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in the Children's Bureau; 53 additional people in the Washington office. Now, here are the types of people that are listed in the justifications that were given to the committee and the salaries which are connected with them. We have, first, a Director of the Division, and that is a new division now within the Bureau, at \$10,800 per year. We have an Assistant Director of the Division at \$9,600. We have 2 Chiefs of Branch, so apparently there will be 2 Branches within the new Division. Each of those people is to receive \$9,600. We have a psychiatrist at \$9,600. We have an after-care consultant—I am not sure just what that is—at a salary of \$8,360. Then we come over here and we have 2 coordination and planning consultants at \$8,360. We have an institutions consultant at \$8,360. We have 2 training consultants at \$8,360. The sole purpose of the appropriation is to start a new division in the Department in the Children's Bureau when the Department itself has not even decided whether it wants this office or the Office of Education to undertake the study.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The Senate committee has been making a very exhaustive study of this problem. They have been holding hearings, and it is very likely that they will recommend basic legislation in the next Congress. Would it not be wise for the House to wait and cooperate with the Senate on basic legislation under a well-thought-out plan instead of going ahead now with a bill that might not do what is intended to be done?

Mr. BUDGE. I would certainly agree with the observation of the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico, particularly in view of the fact that the request for next year which the Children's Bureau has indicated they will make is exactly double the amount which they request in this appropriation.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. The gentleman spoke of two divisions in the same Department. The Department of Education is entirely different from the Welfare Department work. They are two entirely different subjects.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON) there were—ayes 71, noes 77.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON and Mr. TABER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 85, noes 90.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HESELTON: Page 9, line 7, strike out "Provided, That such funds shall not be available after June 30, 1956" and insert the following:

"Grants for hospital construction"

"For an additional amount for 'Grants for hospital construction', to remain available until expended, \$35,000,000, to be available for payments under part G, title VI, of the act, as amended, as follows: for diagnostic or treatment centers, \$10,000,000; for hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired, \$10,000,000; for rehabilitation facilities, \$10,000,000; and for nursing homes, \$5,000,000; *Provided*, That allotments under such part G to the several States for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis of amounts equal to the limitations specified herein.

"Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services"

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services', \$400,000, of which not to exceed \$60,000 may be transferred to 'Salaries and expenses, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation', and not to exceed \$5,900 may be transferred to 'Salaries and expenses, Office of the General Counsel, Health, Education, and Welfare'."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it contains legislation and changes existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from New York please point out the matter he states is legislation?

Mr. TABER. These words in the last part of the amendment make it legislation "of which not to exceed \$60,000 may be transferred to 'Salaries and expenses, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation', and not to exceed \$5,900 may be transferred to 'Salaries and expenses, Office of the General Counsel, Health, Education, and Welfare'."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike those words from the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HESELTON: Page 9, line 7, strike out "Provided, That such funds shall not be available after June 30, 1956" and insert the following:

"Grants for hospital construction"

"For an additional amount for 'Grants for hospital construction', to remain available until expended, \$35,000,000, to be available for payments under part G, title VI, of the

act, as amended, as follows: for diagnostic or treatment centers, \$10,000,000; for hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired, \$10,000,000; for rehabilitation facilities, \$10,000,000; and for nursing homes, \$5,000,000; *Provided*, That allotments under such part G to the several States for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis of amounts equal to the limitations specified herein.

"Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services"

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services', \$400,000."

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, let me make clear at the outset that this is not a personal amendment in a very real sense. This amendment has been authorized, I might say, by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which discussed this problem over the last 2 days. Consequently I am trying to present it objectively and in behalf of the committee which authorized the money involved in the amendment. You may recall, a few weeks ago the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported to the House an extension of the so-called Hill-Burton Act, which should be called, incidentally, the Priest Act, and that the House passed it unanimously. It passed the other body and on July 14 it became a public law. That called for \$60 million, but the administration submitted a request of only \$35 million. I have here a chart showing the projects all over the country submitted by the State agencies. I do not have the time to indicate the extent of this, but let me just call your attention to it. There are 669 projects all ready to go with a total of 41,436 beds. That is divided into general, mental, tuberculosis, chronic diseases, public health centers, nursing homes, and training facilities and adjunct facilities. The estimated cost is a total of \$681,673,000 and the Federal share for 1955 would be \$270,082,000.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Is it not a fact that the amount which the gentleman is suggesting in his amendment is approximately the amount which was authorized by the House in passing the extension of the Hill-Burton Act?

Mr. HESELTON. I do not think that is quite accurate. I think we authorized \$60 million, but the administration only submitted a request for \$35 million.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Actually, this money is to carry out the law passed in the House within the last few weeks; is that not correct?

Mr. HESELTON. Absolutely, there is no question about it.

Mr. DOLLIVER. May I comment, Mr. Chairman, that before the close of this session, we are going to be called upon to pass upon an appropriation which was authorized for foreign aid. There doubtless will be similar enterprises in that bill which amount to a good many millions of dollars. It seems possible to me that we might be willing to look after our own people in this matter of hospital construction by providing the modest amount that is suggested by the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. HESELTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the gentleman.

Mr. HESELTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Do I understand that this amendment, which is being offered, involves supplying the money to implement the program which was just enacted a few days ago?

Mr. HESELTON. That is exactly correct.

May I point out that we have only 12 percent of the chronic-disease beds we need.

The \$35 million requested is to implement the provisions of Public Law 482 approved July 12, 1954. The request, which is \$25 million less than the law authorizes, would provide \$10 million for chronic-disease facilities and \$5 million for nursing homes. These two types of facilities are considerably less expensive to construct than general hospitals and can provide patient care at approximately one-third the cost of patient care per day which must now be given in more expensive general hospitals. It would free more general beds for patients with acute illness and permit more urgently needed facilities for chronic patients not in need of a full hospital regime.

Ten million dollars for diagnostic and treatment facilities to care for ambulatory patients. By emphasizing preventive medicine and care of the ambulant patient, the demands for general hospital beds will be reduced and the total cost to the patient will be less than the cost of hospitalization. This type of facility providing earlier diagnosis would prevent chronic illness and subsequent long-term hospitalization with its tremendous expenditure to the individual.

Ten million dollars for rehabilitation facilities. From an economic standpoint alone the return in taxes paid by rehabilitants is estimated to exceed the cost of rehabilitation. The 83d Congress has passed a bill to expand the number of patients rehabilitated. There is now a great shortage of adequate rehabilitation facilities for both patient care and training purposes.

The report by the House Appropriations Committee indicates that the committee is in sympathy with the new program but fearful that more harm than good will be accomplished by proceeding before any but the most sketchy plans are available. This statement completely overlooks the fact that at no time in the program are construction grant funds approved for expenditure without a comprehensive survey by the State, and approval by the Surgeon General of the State plans required under the survey and planning phase. The House committee based its refusal to approve this item on alleged vagueness of the program presented. However, it must be stressed that many States will complete the survey and planning phase of the program and be ready to embark

upon the construction portion of the program during fiscal year 1955. Moreover, in the case of chronic-disease facilities, for which \$10 million has been requested, all States could proceed almost immediately in view of the fact that this type of facility has been included under the original program and in the current State plans. Although the funds are available for a 2-year period the development of plans and the actual building construction in a community requires from 12 months to 24 months before the buildings are ready for occupancy.

It was emphasized in the testimony that unless the \$35 million was appropriated there would be a delay of a full year in launching the new program in view of extreme reluctance on the part of the States to undertake a new activity unless funds have been appropriated by the Congress. In view of the record of uncertainty with respect to the amount of annual appropriations under the hospital survey and construction program it is not likely that the States would intensively launch upon the survey and planning activities with a mere authorization in the basic law for appropriations.

The full amount of \$35 million would be all encumbered by the end of the 2-year period of availability on these grant funds.

For fiscal year 1955, \$850,000 was appropriated for salaries and expenses to administer a program of \$75 million in grant funds for hospital construction. This was \$25,000 less than was appropriated for fiscal year 1954 when the program was at the \$65 million level and \$350,000 less than fiscal year 1953 when the program was last at the \$75 million level. Mandatory salary increases will further reduce the level of finances for this item.

The appropriation request of the President and the Department for fiscal year 1955 for the \$75 million program level was \$950,000.

Under Public Law 482, 83d Congress, effective July 12, 1954, in order to carry out the additional work incident to the new amendments to the hospital survey and construction program a sum of \$400,000 was requested as essential. This sum for salaries and expenses was included with an appropriation request of \$2 million for survey and planning grants and \$35 million for specified construction grants.

It is pointed out that regardless of whether or not Federal funds are appropriated for construction grants to the States the Public Health Service by the mandates of Public Law 482, 83d Congress, must develop basic policies, procedures, forms, and instructions pertaining to the survey and planning activities of the States in order to assure the uniformity of procedures throughout the Nation.

In addition the provisions of Public Law 482, 83d Congress, also require the Public Health Service with the approval of the Federal Hospital Council to develop and promulgate the necessary and essential regulations pertaining to the

program covered by the new amendments. This entails an extensive workload and in the interest of developing the best possible program, consultation, and assistance from non-Federal groups with special knowledge in the health field. Some of these groups are the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, the nursing home and rehabilitation groups. The provisions of the new law provide a time limit of 6 months from date of enactment—July 12, 1954—for the completion of the new regulations. An extensive educational program is essential in order to assure the establishment of the program called for in Public Law 482, 83d Congress, on a firm and sound basis.

It is impossible to absorb the increased workload under the regular program with the current staff which is smaller than last year and then, in addition, undertake any of the activities called for under the new program.

If funds for construction grants are made available the additional \$400,000 requested will permit an appropriate beginning of this phase of the new program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HESELTON was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. HESELTON. This is a direct challenge to everyone of us who is interested in the problems of the ill, and the aged of this country. If it is desired to stop this program in its tracks then we should turn this amendment down. But if we do have the interest of those people at heart, if we feel that this Congress by unanimously authorizing this amount of money can take some action which should be carried out, honoring our unanimous vote, then I say to you this is your opportunity and perhaps your last opportunity in this Congress to do something constructive in behalf of the people of this country who need your assistance.

I beg you to give your support to this amendment.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. As I recall the legislation that the gentleman is now urging for adoption, came to us first in the form of a message from the President.

Mr. HESELTON. The gentleman is right.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. We then passed enabling legislation on the floor of the House.

Mr. HESELTON. We passed it unanimously.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. The overt act that will destroy the measure now is for us not to appropriate money for carrying out the purposes and objectives of the act.

Mr. HESELTON. The gentleman is correct about that. There is only \$2 million in the bill and that is provided for survey and planning.

There is not 1 penny in the bill for the construction of any of the facilities.

If you want this excellent program extended, if you want to carry out our

recent commitment to the people in our districts, if you want to see that the serious deficit in health facilities is overcome as soon as possible, you should

support the President's recommendation by voting for the amendment.

I am now including for the RECORD the tabulation to which I referred:

TABLE I.—Summary of construction projects reported by State agencies to be eligible to share in Federal funds appropriated under Hill-Burton Act, fiscal year 1955

[Source: State Agency Reports to the Public Health Service. Not an official schedule]

	Number of projects	Hospital beds added, by category					Other facilities			Estimated cost (thousands)	
		Total	General	Mental	Tuberculosis	Chronic disease	Public health center	Nursing homes and training facilities	Adjunct facilities	Total	Federal share, 1955
Total.....	669	41,436	31,398	4,533	1,863	1,342	109	30	25	\$681,673	\$270,082
Alabama.....	13	355	355				3			6,381	4,254
Arizona.....	4	79	55			24				542	271
Arkansas.....	8	380	280			100		2		5,680	3,786
California ²	97	4,196	2,869	103	682	542	19	1	3	67,870	22,160
Colorado.....	11	920	920						1	14,061	4,358
Connecticut.....	10	787	392			395	1		1	11,205	3,119
Delaware ³											
District of Columbia ⁴											
Florida.....	51	2,477	2,330	72		75	9	4	1	35,087	16,571
Georgia.....	38	621	621				30		1	12,955	4,318
Idaho.....	5	107	95			12	2			720	360
Illinois.....	6	285	155	50		80			1	5,890	2,298
Indiana.....	10	663	663					2		9,400	4,700
Iowa.....	6	720	120	600			1		1	10,150	3,373
Kansas.....	8	551	451			100				7,565	3,026
Kentucky.....	8	156	156				2	1	1	3,730	1,865
Louisiana.....	8	743	543	200						10,503	4,315
Maine.....	4	353	353							5,350	3,051
Maryland.....	10	1,590	641	135		814	1	2	8	26,436	9,145
Massachusetts.....	25	1,455	1,455				1			32,310	13,552
Michigan.....	24	1,530	1,530				3	1		27,623	10,428
Minnesota.....	9	392	392				1			7,588	3,119
Mississippi.....	17	471	471				11			7,651	5,104
Missouri.....	12	881	220	248		413				19,940	8,970
Montana.....	4	46	46				1			1,172	469
Nebraska.....	11	365	365					1	2	5,200	2,080
Nevada ⁵											
New Hampshire.....	5	198	198					1		4,100	1,367
New Jersey.....	30	2,366	2,285		81			3		35,193	14,077
New Mexico.....	8	1,972	122	1,800		50	1			6,323	2,486
New York.....	42	3,373	3,263	90		20	1			89,542	29,790
North Carolina.....	15	370	370				7	3		5,801	2,554
North Dakota ³											
Ohio.....	13	1,225	1,035	90	100					23,700	7,894
Oklahoma.....	14	333	333							7,900	4,479
Oregon ²	11	454	454				1			6,185	1,942
Pennsylvania.....	30	3,674	2,780	119		775		8	2	51,249	17,169
Rhode Island.....	1								1	300	100
South Carolina.....	7	160	160							2,213	1,745
South Dakota.....	2	84	84							1,700	850
Tennessee.....	13	946	546	400			1		1	9,862	5,128
Texas.....	14	1,800	1,000		800		2			18,880	9,390
Utah.....	12	695	695				4			17,685	7,879
Vermont.....	4	122	52			70				2,070	656
Virginia.....	12	590	390		200		5			8,460	4,653
Washington.....	3	384	354	30						9,225	3,690
West Virginia.....	2	110	35			75				1,013	618
Wisconsin.....	24	2,327	1,634	596		97	1	1	1	42,829	17,845
Wyoming.....	4	65	65							950	317
Alaska.....	2	30	30				1			700	200
Hawaii.....	2	35	35							784	264
Puerto Rico ³											
Virgin Islands ³											

¹ These 3,642 chronic disease beds would cost approximately 48 million and could use immediately 24 million in Federal funds.

² Projects pertain to 1955 through 1957 fiscal years. State agency did not list projects separately according to fiscal years.

³ Information not supplied.

⁴ No applications for funds anticipated for 1955 fiscal year since more liberal Federal aid under another law (Public Law 221, 82d Cong.) is available.

⁵ No new projects.

I now wish to discuss an analysis of existing law.

ORIGINAL ACT

The Hospital Survey and Construction Act of 1946 authorized Federal grants to the States on a matching basis to pay part of the cost of constructing public and other nonprofit hospitals and related health facilities. Such facilities include general, mental, tuberculosis, and chronic hospitals and public-health centers. As a prerequisite to receiving such grants each State was required to survey its needs for these types of facilities, and develop and keep current a State plan which lists existing hospital and related health facilities in the State. The State plan and its mandatory annual revisions are reviewed and approved by the Surgeon General. In essence, the

plan is a documentation of the State's existing hospital and related health resources as well as a coordinated program for the construction of the additional facilities needed.

SCOPE OF AMENDMENTS

The 1954 amendments to the Hospital Survey and Construction Act authorize appropriations for grants to the States for surveying need and for developing State construction programs to meet the need for four classes of projects: Hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired, nursing homes, diagnostic centers or diagnostic and treatment centers; and rehabilitation facilities. A limited authorization of \$2 million is included to assist the States in the survey and planning phase. The States will survey their existing facilities in these classes

of projects and development programs as supplements to their State plans for meeting these needs. This survey money will be matched, dollar for dollar, by the States. The minimum allotment to any State for survey and planning purposes will be \$25,000.

The 1954 amendments also add to the Hospital Survey and Construction Act an authorization for appropriations to assist in paying part of the cost of construction of these facilities. Annual appropriations totaling \$60 million are authorized for the construction and equipping of facilities by public and other nonprofit sponsors. These appropriations are authorized for the fiscal years 1955, 1956, and 1957, which coincides with the present statutory time limitation of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act. The

authorization of \$60 million is in addition to the annual authorization of \$150 million contained in the present law.

Several of the classes of facilities included by the 1954 amendments were eligible under the existing program, among them rehabilitation facilities and diagnostic or treatment facilities, where part of a hospital, and chronic disease hospitals. The purpose of including these types of facilities under the new and broadened program is to provide a greater stimulus for their construction by specifically earmarking funds for these classes of facilities. The 1954 amendments also authorize assistance for the construction of other classes of facilities not previously approvable under the hospital survey and construction program, namely, diagnostic centers, diagnostic and treatment facilities and rehabilitation facilities when not a part of a hospital, and nursing homes.

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

The annual appropriations authorized by the 1954 amendments will be allotted to the States on the basis of the existing statutory formula, the controlling factors of which are the State's population and per capita income. Amounts authorized annually are as follows: (a) \$20 million for diagnostic centers or diagnostic and treatment centers; (b) \$20 million for chronic-disease hospitals; (c) \$10 million for rehabilitation facilities; and (d) \$10 million for nursing homes. The minimum allotment to any State is \$100,000 for diagnostic or diagnostic and treatment centers, \$100,000 for chronic-disease facilities, \$50,000 for rehabilitation facilities and \$50,000 for nursing homes. The minimum allotment under the existing law is a single sum of \$200,000 to cover the four types of hospitals and public health centers eligible under that portion of the act. Thus the total minimum allotment including the amounts authorized by the 1954 amendments is now \$500,000 to any State.

PROJECT ELIGIBILITY AND AMOUNT OF FEDERAL SHARE

As under the original law, project applications for construction grants must be of high priority, in accordance with State plans, and approved by the State and Federal agency administering the hospital survey and construction program. The States determine the amount of Federal participation for each project and several options are available to the States in making these determinations. Federal matching funds will be a minimum of 33 1/2 percent of the cost of constructing and equipping the project. A maximum of 66 2/3 percent will be available to project sponsors in the lower income States.

Projects receiving funds for construction will be subject to the same procedures and conditions as those presently prescribed. Some examples are the application of the minimum-wage rate determinations under the Davis-Bacon Act for the construction of the project, financial assurances as to the completion and operation of the facility, assurances as to rendering a community service, and assurances as to nondiscrimina-

tion on the grounds of race, creed, or color. Omitted however with respect to all new classes except chronic-disease hospitals, is the existing requirement that the State adopt, by legislation, enforceable standards for maintenance and operation. Instead there is required only assurance of compliance with such standards, if any, as the State may prescribe for such types of facilities.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

The 1954 amendments preserve the existing administrative organization and procedures. However, supplemental regulations will be issued within 6 months by the Surgeon General, subject to the approval of both the Federal Hospital Council and the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. These will cover the classes of projects included by the 1954 amendments. No change in the composition of the Federal Hospital Council is provided for. However, the approval of the Secretary is required in addition to that of the Surgeon General on all projects for rehabilitation facilities.

No change in the administrative organization in the States is required by the 1954 amendments, except that the State agency must include on its advisory council a rehabilitation competency or else provide for consultation with rehabilitation organizations and agencies with respect to rehabilitation facilities.

In accordance with established procedures sponsors of eligible projects must apply to their appropriate State agencies for assistance under the program. The financing of projects serving interstate areas is facilitated by authorizing the transfer of a portion of an annual allotment from one State to another, where justified, for a specific project.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I associate myself with the gentleman from Massachusetts in support of his amendment.

Mr. HESELTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY as an amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. HESELTON: Strike out on line 2 of the Heselon amendment "\$35,000,000" and insert "\$15,700,000"; and on line 4 of the amendment strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$5,225,000"; and on line 5 of the amendment strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$5,225,000"; and on line 5 strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$5,225,000"; and on line 6, strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$2,625,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, ever since the Hill-Burton bill was enacted into law I have been appearing on the floor of this House in favor of the full amount of the authorization of that particular law to build hospital beds in this country. When the authorization was \$75 million I was for the \$75 million a year; when the authorization was raised to \$150 million for the construction of hospital beds under the Hill-Burton Act I was for the \$150 million to build hospital beds on account of the lack of beds at that time and at the present time. I do not think there has been a more consistent supporter of the Hill-Burton Act or this act that we have before us than

I. But I do not want to see us appropriating money today that we have no guaranty will be expended in the next fiscal year.

This \$15,700,000 will give a minimum allotment of \$300,000 to every State and the 5 Territories, including the District of Columbia, which adds up to a total of \$15,700,000. This would allow us to start the program, this would allow every State a chance to get some of this aid money and a chance to make surveys and come up with plans and applications so that next year we can look at this in a more realistic manner and come before the Members of Congress with a more definite plan than we have at the present time. There is no plan at the present time for the spending of this \$35 million next year; in fact it was testified that in all probability it could not be spent in the fiscal year 1955 but would run over for a 2-year period into 1956.

I cannot see any sense at all in appropriating that amount of money when we know that it will not be expended; however, as a supporter of the program I want it to proceed.

What has been the history of it? The history of the new program when it was presented to us was a 3-year program of \$60 million a year to provide more beds for the chronically ill and to provide more centers for rehabilitation of the elderly people of this country.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, will allow every State \$100,000 for chronic facilities, \$100,000 for diagnostic and treatment centers, \$50,000 for nursing homes, and \$50,000 for rehabilitation facilities. Now, with that kind of a start, I am convinced that every State will be given a chance to come into the program. I agree with everything that has been said about the shortage of these facilities. There is no question about the shortage existing at the present time, but I do not want to see this program get off to a bad start. The President requested a program of \$180 million for a 3-year period or \$60 million a year.

Now, this year—and I think we should remember this and keep this in mind—they recommended a cut of \$25 million in the Hill-Burton Act, with the idea that \$60 million would be appropriated under this particular program. And, as the hour was getting late in this session of the Congress, they came before us with a supplemental of \$25 million for Hill-Burton, and we finally ended up and passed that a few weeks ago, giving the full \$75 million for the construction of hospital beds, mostly in the general hospital-bed category, which was the full amount that we have been giving in other years and \$10 million more than we gave last year. Now, I am afraid that this is the beginning of the end of the old Hill-Burton Act; that this type of legislation is the type of legislation that will eventually replace the Hill-Burton construction funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. And, I do not want to see that happen, either, because in the 14 years that I have been a Member of this body, I have never seen a Government program work as well as the Hill-Burton Act. I do not believe any program in all of the communities in the States of this country has received more universal approval than the Hill-Burton Act, and I want to see this program go along, too, because I believe this is a good program. It will provide beds, as my friend from Massachusetts stated a short while ago, to the chronically ill. It will take men and women with chronic diseases out of hospitals at the present time and make room for those who are on the waiting list. But, I do not want to see this program get off on the wrong foot. We have had 1 or 2 or 3 bad examples under the Hill-Burton Act, but I must say that the percentage of bad examples under the Hill-Burton Act was infinitesimal as far as the amount of money that we have appropriated. I think some \$600 million has been expended so far under the Hill-Burton Act, and we have only had 2 or 3 or 4 small projects that did not turn out right. I think that is a wonderful example of a good program, and that is why I am not for the \$35 million that has been offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, but I am offering this as a substitute of \$15.7 million. I believe that this can be expanded, that the communities on the local level will meet this \$15.7 million which will be expanded next year and we will get off to a good start on a good program.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman answered my question. I wanted to be sure what the total of the various figures in his amendment was. I understand it is \$15.7 million.

Mr. FOGARTY. The total is \$15.7 million, which makes a minimum of \$300,000 for every State, including 4 or 5 Territories and the District of Columbia, with the exception of the Virgin Islands, which only receives under this amendment less than \$100,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 2 speeches for the amendment and 2 against, each of 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to say that there have been only three requests to speak under the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to limit debate on this amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, in that event, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 min-

utes, the time to be divided equally among three speakers.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. To which amendment is this agreement on limitation of debate to be applied, the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] or the amendment of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]?

Mr. TABER. If I may answer the gentleman, it applies to both amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, it had been my intention to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] for the full \$35 million for this program. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has offered a substitute in the amount of \$15,700,000 which will guarantee to each State and Territory a minimum of \$300,000.

The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee handling this appropriation, and I believe he has made a very fair statement of the situation facing the Committee of the Whole at this time. I rise at this time to support the Fogarty substitute for the reasons which he so ably and logically presented to the Committee a few minutes ago.

I am very much interested in this program. It happened to be the first important bill reported by our committee during this session. We brought the authorizing legislation before the House early in the session. It passed some time ago, but without an appropriation all of that effort goes for naught. I was prepared to support the full amount of \$35 million for this purpose, but I believe the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has given sound justification for his substitute of \$15,700,000. If the committee will approve the substitute amendment, I believe it will enable the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, cooperating with the States, to develop plans and to put the program on a sound footing in the very beginning.

It is a program in which I have been greatly interested, as all of the Members know, from the very inception of the original Hill-Burton Hospital Survey and Construction Act. I do not want to see anything done in that program that would in any sense retard it in the future. Therefore, instead of supporting the Heselton amendment, which I had intended to do, I am supporting the Fogarty amendment.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Will the gentleman tell us—or perhaps the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] can—why the administration asked for \$35 million

if it did not yet have its program worked out under which it would use it? Would somebody explain that?

Mr. PRIEST. I should prefer to have the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] answer that question, because he heard all of the testimony from the Department. I yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think the most logical reason is that this legislation was asked for the first part of the year. The President signed this bill only a couple of weeks ago, on July 12, in fact less than a couple of weeks ago. Here we are already into the fiscal year and there have been no plans, no surveys in the various States that have been made. We do not have the applications for these funds at the present time. It is going to take about 6 months to get going, to find out what is needed, and then we will be into the next fiscal year.

Mr. JUDD. This request for \$35 million came down when they were expecting the authorizing legislation to become law, early in the year?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is correct.

Mr. PRIEST. That is my judgment. It was a part of a broader program; and if it had been enacted into law earlier, I think a \$35 million appropriation would have been fully justified.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. HESELTON. It is my understanding that the amount involved in my amendment would remain available for 2 years, the reason being that many of these facilities cannot be constructed in a 1-year period. Some are over a period of 24 months.

In addition, the tabulation I had there shows there are approved projects in the amount of \$48 million. I agree with the gentleman from Rhode Island and with the gentleman from Tennessee. I do not want to do anything to hurt this program. But I cannot see why we cut it if we already have approved by the State agencies programs to that extent.

Mr. PRIEST. I did not have those figures available insofar as the State plans are concerned. I do know that in many of the States there are approvable projects now being considered, but insofar as their having been made a part of a State plan and approved as ready for action, I think that will not be the case until some time in the future.

I hope the House will support the Fogarty amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, let me state at the outset that I am for this program 100 percent, so that my remarks, I assure you, will not be directed at trying to scuttle the program, to delay it, or to hinder its operation in any way.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] admitted that the Subcommittee on Appropriations used good judgment—and I give full credit to the men who heard the testimony, because I was absent in Europe with the Kersten committee at the time—in allowing the full amount requested for surveying and planning, and in holding in abeyance

the actual appropriations for construction. The Heselton amendment proposes that the funds should remain available until expended. I call your attention to the language of the bill on page 9. If they are far enough along with their planning and surveying, and if they know what they are doing, the language in the bill should be sufficient, because it states: "Provided, That such funds shall not be available after June 30, 1956." That gives them 2 years to spend the money for surveys and planning.

I do not believe they are ready for the construction money. I read from the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESLTON] where he said:

This statement completely overlooks the fact that at no time in the program are construction-grant funds approved for expenditure without a comprehensive survey by the State and approval by the Surgeon General of the State plans required under the survey and planning phase.

I spent quite a number of weeks and months last year surveying hospitals, among other things, in this country, and let me tell you this one thing: One hospital I surveyed was down at Denmar, W. Va., where we had provided a considerable amount of money to build a wing on a tuberculosis hospital. That wing had been completed over 3 years. The equipment is still unpacked to this day because of a delay in surveying and planning by the State of West Virginia, and because they had these Hill-Burton funds allocated to them before they were ready for them. It will take a full year to survey and plan this situation. It is an entirely new field. Many of the hospitals will not be ready for construction for at least 12 months from today. If they are to do a comprehensive job and really to know what they are talking about, instead of just spending money because it is available for these different chronic-disease hospitals without proper consideration, you will defer appropriating money for construction until the survey and planning have been completed. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESLTON] also referred to the number of applications for beds for these chronic-disease hospitals. I have examined the tabulation, and I find that only 16 States out of the 48 States and the Territories have said, "Here we have some projects we would like to start building." There is no one in this Chamber that can prove they have made an adequate survey and completed adequate plans for these so-called chronic-disease hospitals. I think this chronic-disease hospital program is one of the most forward steps we have taken in hospital construction, in many, many years. Let us not be too hasty and do it without proper consideration, and then have regrets later; as we have in so many other instances where the appropriation has been pushed through on the floor of the House without proper consideration and by emotional appeals which have nothing whatsoever to do with the facts. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] said it is high time that we look after our own people, and that we will have a foreign-aid appropriation bill before us within a few

days. I agree with him that we should look after our own people. But by voting these amendments down, you will not hurt the people at all. You will help the people to get the adequate and proper treatment and care to which they are entitled.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say at the outset that it is certainly not the intention of the Committee on Appropriations to attempt to delay or to destroy this program. This is the situation which confronted us, and I think our action was logical in view of the facts which were presented to us. This is a double barreled request. In the first place, the Department seeks \$2 million to conduct a survey in all of the States and Territories and the District of Columbia to determine what facilities will be necessary. Now the other barrel says that in this fiscal year the Department wants \$35 million to spend. This is what they said about the way they were going to spend it. This is Dr. Cronin speaking, the man who administers this program in the Public Health Service, and so far as I am aware, qualified to administer it.

Dr. CRONIN. We have a fairly good idea in two areas of what the States can cover. It needs to be sharpened up. One area is chronic disease. The States have put 85 percent of the funds in general hospitals. The other area we have a fairly good idea is diagnostic or treatment centers, which will be built as authorized under this act. In the areas of nursing homes and rehabilitation facilities, we just do not know. We would not even attempt to guess in those two areas.

Now I ask you in all fairness what other course could the Committee on Appropriations take on the basis of that testimony, but to say, "All right, we will give you the full \$2 million which you requested to prepare your plans to spend in the final analysis over \$100 million of Federal money, but we want you to complete the planning and then come in and we will give you the money for the construction." That is certainly a reasonable approach, and the only thing which the Committee on Appropriations could have done on the basis of the testimony which was given to us.

As a matter of fact, they do not even claim that they can even guess how much of this money can be obligated. I call your attention to one other thing which I think is very important. The original request for funds in the Hill-Burton Act was \$50 million. The Committee on Appropriations approved it in its entirety. We got a supplemental for an additional \$25 million. We approved that in its entirety for the total program for this year for \$75 million. On top of that, there is a carryover from last year's funds as of the first of July of \$15 million, which the Department was unable to obligate in the fiscal year 1954.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BUDGE. In just a moment.

On yesterday we had a very splendid speech from the distinguished majority

leader in which he referred to fiscal responsibility. That fiscal responsibility lies right in this Chamber. That is not something that we can blame upon the President, upon the other body, upon anybody else; that fiscal responsibility is ours. Whether we appropriate \$17 million, or \$35 million, or \$15.7 million, when the people cannot even tell you how they are going to spend it and say they need \$2 million in order to find out how to spend it, I say that we do not meet our obligation of living up to what we in this Chamber must meet, fiscal responsibility.

I think the course taken by the Appropriations Committee was the only proper thing which we could have done, and the only thing which in fairness to the program should be done at this time.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Will the gentleman tell us how he stands on the program with reference to either one of these amendments, or whether he is against the program in its entirety?

Mr. BUDGE. I would say I am completely in sympathy with the \$2 million appropriation to conduct the surveys they say are necessary.

I would say that the substitute amendment is twice as good as the original amendment, in my judgment, although both should be defeated because funds should not be spent until the survey and planning is completed; otherwise we will have abuses which may well destroy the entire program.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in personal support, and to urge the support of all of you, of this amendment for a supplemental Federal appropriation to enable States to plan for and build diagnostic centers, hospitals for the chronically ill, medical rehabilitation facilities, and nursing homes because testimony from eminent and authoritative sources is convincing of their vital need.

Surely there is no better or more lasting investment than money spent to protect the health of our people. On the practical side, the productive loss to our economy caused by the protracted illness of individuals is staggering, not to mention the damage to the happiness and the spirit of so many citizens who unquestionably could be expeditiously returned to normal health if adequate medical facilities were available.

No one will question that the substantive Hill-Burton Act has been of continuing and immeasurable benefit to our national welfare, but it is as readily admitted fundamental deficiencies still exist.

While we know that approximately 70 percent of the need for general hospital beds has been met through construction undertaken with and without Federal assistance, the need has not been similarly met for other types of facilities such

as chronic disease hospitals and rehabilitation facilities for the physically handicapped. Nor does the existing program encourage the construction of diagnostic centers and rehabilitation facilities separate and apart from hospitals, and nursing homes were not included.

Expert committee testimony of record demonstrates that a great demand for chronic disease and nursing home facilities has inevitably arisen because of the tremendous increase in the population aged 65 and over. Unfortunately, this increase in the number of aged persons has likewise contributed to the incidence of the chronic and degenerative diseases. To date, only 12 percent of the need for chronic disease beds throughout the Nation has been met. By simple logical thinking, we are made to realize that nursing homes are essential to the development of comprehensive medical plans for the care of our aging population. It is obvious that the availability of additional chronic disease beds and nursing home beds will not only help meet the urgent need for those beds, but also tend to make more readily available, for acute patient care, those beds in general hospitals now occupied by the chronically ill or long-term patients.

The value of diagnostic centers is very easily appreciated by sensible reflection that their impact will be that of emphasizing the preventive aspects of modern medicine, therefore bringing about an ultimate decrease in the need for expensive inpatient care. Furthermore, there are, of course, communities, particularly in rural and remote areas, that are financially unable to plan, build, or maintain general hospitals. These communities will be eligible to construct diagnostic-in-treatment centers to make essential health services more readily available to their people.

From the preponderant evidence presented, none of us can have any doubt that we must adopt a comprehensive approach to the rehabilitation of our handicapped citizens and erect facilities for such purpose throughout the country. The United States is currently rehabilitating about 65,000 people each year, but there are about 250,000 capable of being rehabilitated. It has been testified by responsible officials and experts, year after year, that for every dollar of Federal funds appropriated for this purpose, the Federal Government receives \$10 back; that is certainly and positively excellent economy. There is, then, no qualified reason in the world why we should not expand this program that actually is materially profitable as well as being a concrete demonstration of the Christian character of our Nation.

Medical experts tell us the cause and cure of such dreadful afflictions among others as cancer, multiple sclerosis, muscular dystrophy, cerebral palsy, arthritis, rheumatism, heart disease, and even blindness can be eventually found. With adequate facilities for continuing study and research they are confident of success. It is my own heartfelt conviction that Federal expenditures, for continuing medical research and health protection, pay for themselves a million times over—in the reduction of human suffering and in direct economic returns to

individuals and the Nation as a whole. Even at a time when I well realize we must examine all Federal appropriations with critical scrutiny, I do not hesitate to ask you, in Christian charity and practical wisdom, to unanimously approve this amendment as a sound contribution to the national welfare.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 80, noes 41.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUDGE: Page 9, lines 5 through 7, strike out "For payments to States for surveys and planning activities pursuant to title 6 of the Public Health Act, as amended, \$2,000,000."

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment is obvious. The House in its wisdom has seen fit to expend a portion of the construction funds called for in the original proposal. If we are to proceed with the construction program, which we, of course, will do under the action which the House just took, I see no justification for leaving the \$2 million in to conduct a survey to determine how the construction funds are to be spent. I hope the amendment will be adopted to save this \$2 million to conduct a survey which obviously is not necessary if we go ahead and spend the money before we complete the survey.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot believe that the gentleman from Idaho is sincere in offering this amendment to cut \$2 million off. This \$2 million that we allowed in committee was for planning and surveying, in other words, to make plans for this program. I am sure that the gentleman is not serious in offering this amendment because if the program is going to be run right you would have to have minimum standards in every community. You cannot allow firetraps to be built in this community or that community and have the program stand up.

If we come back here next year and are called upon to appropriate, as is authorized, \$60 million for this new program next year, I think we ought to have the benefit of these surveys and the benefit of the plans in the States that have made them between now and the next fiscal year.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. May I assure the gentleman that my amendment is offered in all sincerity. I do not feel that the survey should be conducted at the same time we are spending the money for the purpose for which the survey is being conducted. I am very sincere.

Mr. FOGARTY. Maybe the gentleman is sincere, but he knows, I think, that the States can already go ahead without surveys on some things, like chronic hospital beds. We know there is a backlog of \$20 million for chronic hospital beds that can be met by Federal appropriation. Unless we have this money for surveying and planning you will not have a well-regulated program to vote on. You are going to have to get plans for next year when we come back, when the administration will probably make a request of the Budget Bureau for \$60 million for this new program in 1956.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it not the fact that deletion of this \$2 million for planning and survey activities, as proposed by the gentleman from Idaho, would do more harm to this hospital-construction program than failure to adopt the previous amendment?

Mr. FOGARTY. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: Page 9, line 9, after "\$2,625,000", insert "Salaries and expenses hospital construction services. For an additional amount for salaries and expenses hospital construction services, \$200,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the language in the bill has already been changed by an amendment and the gentleman's amendment is not in order at this time.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I thought this was regular procedure. I am offering it at the end of the amendment that was adopted to provide money for the salaries and expenses of this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say to the gentleman that this amendment should have been offered to the Heseltun amendment; however, if the gentleman desires to offer it as a separate paragraph, the gentleman may do so.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer it as a new paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 9, preceding line 9, after "\$2,625,000", insert "Salaries and expenses hospital construction services. For an additional amount for salaries and expenses hospital construction services, \$200,000."

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUDGE. As I understood the Heseltun amendment at the time it was read at the desk, it included an item of \$400,000 for salaries and expenses. Now, would the effect of adopting the Fogarty amendment at this point be to reduce

the \$400,000 to \$200,000, or is this adding new money to the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The Heselton amendment provides for \$400,000, and this is an additional amount. The Chair believes the gentleman has a right to offer it.

Mr. BUDGE. I do not quite understand the Chair's ruling.

The CHAIRMAN. The Heselton amendment provides for \$400,000, and this amendment provides for \$200,000. The new amendment provides for \$200,000 additional.

Mr. BUDGE. Is it in lieu of the \$400,000 or is it in addition to it?

The CHAIRMAN. It is in addition to. This is a new paragraph.

Mr. TABER. That means that the total sum would be \$600,000.

The CHAIRMAN. That is for the committee to determine, not for the Chair. But, the Chair would state that if the amendment is adopted, it would be \$600,000. It is a new paragraph for \$200,000 additional.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, is this not the situation? The gentleman from Rhode Island has offered an amendment which has been adopted. Now he is offering another amendment in order to carry out the provisions of that amendment by making the money available to carry it out. That, to me, seems to be the situation.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FOGARTY. It was my understanding that my amendment offered to the Heselton amendment did not carry any provision for salaries and expenses. I thought that, when the Heselton amendment was adopted with my amendment, there was no provision for salaries and expenses. Is that not right?

The CHAIRMAN. The Heselton amendment as amended carried \$400,000. Now this is a new paragraph which provides for \$200,000 as stated in the amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. In addition?

The CHAIRMAN. Additionally.

Mr. TABER. In addition to the \$400,000.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may withdraw my amendment and offer an amendment to cut the \$400,000 to \$200,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I make the further parliamentary inquiry as to what the net result of the request would be moneywise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island will have to explain that.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follow:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY to the amendment offered by Mr. HESELTON: Under the item "Salaries and expenses, hospital

construction services," strike out "\$400,000" and insert "\$200,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe this needs much explanation. The original request for salaries and expenses was \$400,000, with an appropriation of \$35 million. We have already, by action of this committee, appropriated \$15,700,000. I think that 50 percent of the amount that was originally requested or \$200,000 will be all that will be needed to run this program under an appropriation of \$15,700,000.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. BUDGE. I merely want to say that the provision certainly seems to be equitable, so far as the members of the committee on this side are concerned, we are happy to accept it.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. This has not been clear to me but I am sure it can be made clear. Was the \$400,000 that was suggested in addition to the \$35 million in the Heselton amendment?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. PRIEST. It was not included in the \$35 million?

Mr. FOGARTY. No.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. HESELTON. I feel that the gentleman is proceeding absolutely in the proper way. However, there was included in my amendment a provision for transfers in the amount of \$48,000 and \$5,500. I withdrew that upon a point of order. Does the gentleman's amendment provide for any transfer authority?

Mr. FOGARTY. No transfer authority, just \$200,000 for salaries and expenses.

Mr. HESELTON. The gentleman does not think the transfers are necessary?

Mr. FOGARTY. I think it can be worked out all right; or it may be that it can be worked out in the other body.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly that an engagement before the Committee on Rules prevented me, as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, from being present during this entire debate.

I wish at this time to present my views with respect to the necessity and the propriety of increasing the amount that has been allotted to this important work by the Committee on Appropriations. In my opinion, that committee has totally ignored the great need that exists in this country of ours for the particular facilities for which the Appropriations Committee has made such drastic cuts. Adequate appropriations for those facilities were approved by the President and by the budget. The House just recently, by a unanimous vote, provided the authority to make the appropriations requested by the President and the Budget Bureau. It seems to me there has been a total disregard of the actual needs of the case by the Appropriations Committee. I am glad that there has been some increase

made but I wish a greater step forward had been taken.

While I appreciate the interest that has been taken by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] with reference to an increase in the appropriation appearing in this bill for the construction of chronic-disease hospitals, nursing homes, diagnostic and treatment centers, and rehabilitation facilities, yet I must speak frankly and say that the increase advocated by the gentleman was, in my opinion, far too little. It does not begin to be adequate. If we can spend billions to rehabilitate Europe and other parts of the world, why should we pinch our pennies when it comes to doing something for our own people? Within a few days we will be asked by this same Appropriations Committee to spend \$3 or \$3½ billion for foreign aid, and yet the same committee endeavors to cut down help for the sick and handicapped in our own country. I can see no justification for such a course.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as I have already said, made a study of this whole subject that covered months. Our hearings developed the fact that a great need exists. It was because of this that the committee reported the legislation. It was because of this that this House unanimously passed the bill. The Senate did likewise. The President signed the bill. It thus became law. And now, when it comes time to make it effective, the Appropriations Committee tries to stop it by refusing funds to carry out these laudable objectives. Certainly our country has not become so poor that it cannot adequately take care of our sick and handicapped by making the necessary appropriation of funds to carry out the desire and intent of Congress.

On January 18, 1954, the President submitted to the Congress a message containing certain recommendations to improve the health of the American people. Among his recommendations was one proposing that that program be expanded to include additional assistance for the construction of public and other nonprofit hospitals for the care of the chronically ill, as well as to include assistance in the construction of public and other nonprofit nursing homes, rehabilitation facilities, and diagnostic or treatment centers. He also recommended grants to the States for surveying their need for such facilities, in order to provide a sound basis for Federal assistance authorized by the expanded program. The Appropriations Committee responds only to the latter. I am glad that the House has already shown a willingness to do more than that by providing at least approximately \$15 million.

Current State plans indicate that at the present time about 70 percent of our national need for general hospital beds has been met both through construction under the Hill-Burton Act and through construction undertaken without the assistance of Federal funds.

However, in the case of certain other types of facilities now authorized under title VI, namely, chronic-disease hospitals, out-patient departments in hospitals, for diagnosis and treatment of ambulatory patients, and rehabilitation

facilities for the physically handicapped, the need has not been similarly met.

CHRONIC DISEASE BEDS AND NURSING HOMES

Beds for the chronically ill may be made available either in chronic-disease hospitals or in nursing homes depending on the degree of medical and nursing care required by the patients. To date, only 12 percent of the national need has been met for beds in chronic-disease hospitals. Information as to the extent of the need for nursing home facilities in each area and community in the country has also been shown.

The availability of additional chronic-disease beds and of nursing-home beds would not only help to meet the great need for these beds on the part of the chronically ill, but would also tend to make more readily available, for acute-patient care, beds in general hospitals now occupied by chronically ill or long-term patients. It is important to note that beds in chronic-disease hospitals and in nursing homes are less expensive to build than general-hospital beds. Thus, with such Federal funds as will be available, more chronic-disease and nursing-home beds can be constructed for every dollar expended than is the case with general hospital beds.

Furthermore, the cost of maintenance and operation of chronic-disease hospitals and nursing homes is considerably lower than the cost of maintaining and operating general hospitals. Testimony before our committee indicated that long-term-patient care in chronic-disease hospitals averages \$6.63 per patient-day as compared with the average operating cost of \$18.35 per patient-day in short-term general hospitals. This lower cost of operation and maintenance would reduce considerably the financial burden borne by chronically ill patients and by States and local governments and nonprofit organizations in the operation and maintenance of facilities for long-term patient care.

The great demand for facilities for the chronically ill has been brought about by the tremendous increase in the old-age group of our population in relation to the rest of the population. The national population has doubled from 1900 to 1950. During the same period, however, there has been a fourfold increase in the number of people aged 65 years or over—from 3 million to 12 million persons. This increased number of aged persons has contributed to the incidence of chronic disease, such as cancer and heart disease. Testimony before your committee brought out the fact that those 65 years of age and over require twice as much hospital care on the average each year as do persons under 65 years of age.

FACILITIES FOR AMBULATORY PATIENTS

Diagnostic and treatment clinics are essential to a complete medical service in the community. By emphasizing the preventive aspects of modern medicine, this type of facility helps to decrease the need for the much more expensive in-patient hospital bed care.

There are communities, moreover, which presently do not have hospitals

and where the likelihood of hospitals being constructed is remote because the communities in question are financially unable to build and maintain hospitals. It is expected that in those communities the construction of diagnostic or treatment centers will make more readily available health services that otherwise would be available only in urban centers far removed from such communities.

REHABILITATION FACILITIES

Rehabilitation of disabled individuals is important not only because of humanitarian considerations but also because of the resulting economic benefits. Rehabilitation of an individual to the point where he can at least care for himself is an important step in relieving the economic burden on families and the patient load in hospitals and nursing homes. Rehabilitation for employment has a direct effect in reducing governmental relief expenditures in those instances where disabled persons have been carried on the public assistance rolls. Furthermore, disabled persons returning to work contribute to the support of Federal, State, and local government by payment of taxes.

The committee study shows that additional rehabilitation facilities are needed for the following reasons: First, services provided in a rehabilitation facility are in many respects an extension of the treatment and services provided in a hospital. Second, it is both logical and economical to utilize the established administrative machinery and experience of the Public Health Service and of the State agencies now administering the facilities. Third, rehabilitation facilities have many construction features, and render some services comparable to those of hospitals and related health facilities. Fourth, the construction of additional rehabilitation facilities is a factor which will tend to reduce the demand for hospital and nursing-home beds.

SURVEY AND PLANNING

Following the precedent of title VI of the Public Health Service Act as originally enacted, the bill authorized an appropriation for grants to assist the States in surveying the existing facilities in the categories covered by the bill and in developing revised State plans and construction programs. The aggregate amount so authorized to be appropriated is \$2 million, and any amount appropriated would remain available until expended. The amounts appropriated would be allotted among the States on a population basis, but the minimum allotment for any State would be \$25,000. The State would be required to match these funds on a dollar-for-dollar basis.

The importance of this survey and planning provision cannot be too strongly emphasized. The surveys made under the present law have contributed greatly to the success of the program.

I am strongly of the opinion that there should be adequate funds provided for the purposes I have outlined.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I want to say this to my good friend from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], that the Committee on Appropriations was not

totally to blame for this. If the gentleman will take the time to read the hearings, to read the testimony presented to us in justification of the \$35 million request, I believe he would hesitate to approve that request.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I would say to the gentleman that I have felt that if the Committee on Appropriations would take the time to read the testimony before our committee, taken over a period of months, that that committee would have come to a different conclusion.

Mr. FOGARTY. The Committee on Appropriations was the last committee before which this group appeared. It is the same group that appeared before the gentleman's committee. We had the most up-to-date information, the last minute information that was available. I think the record speaks for itself.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. GARY. As I understand it, the question that was before the Committee on Appropriations was not the advisability of appropriating that amount for the program, but the advisability of appropriating it at this time?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] as modified.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members participating in the debate today have permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRIEDEL: On page 9, after line 8, insert:

"Social Security Administration, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance

"None of the funds available to the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance shall be used to pay any costs, direct or indirect, of moving any group of employees of the Bureau from Baltimore, Md., to Washington, D. C."

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, the Social Security Administration and its various agencies is located throughout the city of Baltimore in many office buildings. For the purpose of efficiency and economy, the Congress appropriated \$25,370,000 to construct a building to bring all the branches of the Social Security Administration in and around Baltimore under one roof. The employees of the Administration number about 5,200. During consideration of this authorization, it was brought out in the Appropriation Committee hearings that the building had ample space for 6,000 employees.

An official departmental memorandum, dated August 11, 1953, informed the employees that in obtaining the new building, there would be space for all employees of the Bureau in Baltimore.

Enclosed is a photostatic copy of this memorandum:

OFFICE MEMORANDUM, UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT

AUGUST 11, 1953.

To: All Bureau employees in Baltimore.
From: Robert M. Ball, Acting Director.
Subject: Location of the new Bureau Building.

On July 31, when President Eisenhower signed our 1954 appropriation bill, we passed another important milestone toward obtaining a new building with space for all employees of the Bureau in Baltimore. Arrangements had been made for the General Services Administration to set about acquiring a site immediately after the bill was signed.

On August 6 the first advertisement for proposals to sell or donate land for the site appeared in the Baltimore newspapers. They specify that the site shall be in Baltimore or its vicinity. The advertisement will continue to be run in the Baltimore newspapers until August 26, when all proposals received will be opened in the Baltimore office of the General Services Administration.

We hope that a number of proposals will be received in order to permit a wide choice in selecting a site. After the proposals are opened, the General Services Administration will make appraisals and preliminary site recommendations, working in conjunction with Bureau and Administration staff so that a selection recommendation may be made for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. We are going to try to have a site finally decided upon by the end of September.

In situations of this kind, of course, a variety of rumors and reports arise respecting the favoring or selection of sites. I assure you that no choice nor any determinations leading to a choice have been made. The selection is wide open, as the advertisement indicates, and will be made only after all proposals have been received. I know that the location is of deep interest to all of you. I will keep you informed of our progress in determining the building location as well as of any other important matter relating to the new building.

ROBERT M. BALL.

I wish you would pay particular attention to the fact that the memorandum clearly states "all Bureau employees in Baltimore."

On the basis of this memorandum many of the employees bought homes in Baltimore and quite a few have large mortgages outstanding.

Nine months later, on May 11, 1954, another memorandum was issued to all Bureau employees advising them that 450 members of headquarters staff of the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance would be transferred to Washington.

Subsequently, in the supplemental budget of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which we are considering today, a request was made for \$130,000 for the purpose of transferring these 450 employees to Washington and funds were to be diverted from the OASI trust fund to pay per diem to these people. This request was refused by the Appropriations Committee. I would like to quote the language on page 17 of Report No. 2266, accompanying H. R. 9936:

The committee expressly denies the requested authority to use funds from the OASI trust fund to pay per diem to the 450 employees proposed to be moved to Washington from Baltimore and seriously questions the advisability of such a move.

I would also like to submit, at this point, a letter I received from the Honorable FRED E. BUSHEY, chairman, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee on Appropriations, and call your particular attention to his statement that "the \$25,370,000 authorized for the construction of a building in Baltimore was based on the estimated cost, including space for the 450 employees in question."

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 17, 1954.

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: This is in reply to your letter of June 21, to which was attached a copy of a letter you sent to Senator BRIDGES, concerning the proposed transfer of approximately 450 employees of the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance from Baltimore to Washington.

As you no doubt know, there was no language in the regular 1955 appropriation bill, or the report thereon, concerning this matter. The subject did arise in connection with supplemental requests recently considered by the House Appropriations Committee. The committee's report, which was issued yesterday, covers this subject on page 17. The first paragraph of that page is directly pertinent, and I believe you would be interested in the fact that the \$25,370,000, authorized in the second paragraph for the construction of a building in Baltimore, is based on the estimated cost including space for the 450 employees in question.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

FRED E. BUSHEY,
Member of Congress, Chairman, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee on Appropriations.

My amendment, which reads, "None of the funds available to the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance shall be used to pay any costs, direct or indirect, of moving any group of employees of the Bureau from Baltimore, Md., to Washington, D. C.," is a very simple one. It merely expresses the intent of the Appropriations Committee as indicated in the above-mentioned report. Further, it will not cost the taxpayers a penny, but will, in turn, be a great saving.

I would also like to bring to your attention the serious effect such a move will have on Baltimore City, already a surplus labor area. Our shipbuilding and labor industry have been hard hit. Over 2,000 employees have been laid off in the past year. Before the year is out Baltimore will lose another 2,000 employees as a result of the transfer of the Baltimore Signal Depot to Tobyhanna, Pa.

You can readily see what an additional blow it would be to the economy of the great city of Baltimore should these 450 employees be transferred.

For the reasons which I have outlined, I urge you to adopt this amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. As far as I am personally concerned, I do not think there is any objection on this side of the Committee on Appropriations to the

gentleman's amendment. I think it would be very foolish to bring more such groups back into this city, overcrowded as it is.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. The new social-security building is in my district. I concur in the statement of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL]. It seems foolish to put up this huge building, which can amply take care of the employees of the Social Security Administration, and then have them bring some of those people over here to Washington, where we are already so crowded.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. The Department sought funds to pay per diems for a short period for these 450 employees they intended to bring from Baltimore to Washington. The employees have been in Baltimore for some 13 years. The committee has recommended the erection of a building there for their use, at a cost of some \$26 million. It would seem that the committee thought the proper place for them to be working is in Baltimore. We have no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. On behalf of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOCARTY], who is in charge of this phase of the bill for the minority side, and all the minority members of the committee, let me say that the gentleman's amendment is agreeable and that we accept it. I suggest that there be an immediate vote on this amendment.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the chairman of the committee regarding the \$3 million for inpatient care in the Veterans' Administration. My understanding is that that is the supplemental request of Mr. Higley for money to start the hospitals, that he neglected to ask for in the other bill. Is that not correct?

Mr. PHILLIPS. If the gentleman will yield, if she wishes to say that he neglected to ask for it, I probably would not take too much exception to the word, but the fact of the matter is that the Veterans' Administration made a very firm and conclusive justification for the amount which was given them in the regular budget. We gave them the entire amount. We made changes in the method of handling the money which would be to their advantage. We

showed them methods of saving, which they recognized, that would amount to say \$5 million or more.

In the interval between the passage of the regular bill and the consideration of the supplemental bill, it was discovered that the Veterans' Administration had permitted the number of occupied beds to go above the authorization by about 2,000 beds. Consequently the subcommittee, recognizing that the situation would be very difficult for the Veterans' Administration said, "Well, you had no authorization to do this. We believe that you did it perhaps through an error or a misunderstanding on your part, or"—whatever the word the gentlewoman used was—"miscalculation. We will go along with you and give you the additional money." Under those circumstances, what the gentlewoman chooses to call it is a matter of her own choice.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Perhaps he did not understand or he did not realize. Of course, Mr. Higley, I think, has been operating under some difficulty because he is new and he has had various investigators going about investigating those who have the functions of the Veterans' Administration and making suggestions as to cuts in personnel. Mr. Higley, as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, has one of the most difficult positions in Government. There have been so many investigations of the Veterans' Administration, I wonder how it can function at all.

Mr. PHILLIPS. If the gentlewoman will permit me, I think the greatest difficulty he is working under in this particular is probably the failure of the head of the Medical Department to give him accurate figures.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know insofar as Brockton Hospital is concerned, since no more money is appropriated, they have had to close down certain wards.

Mr. PHILLIPS. No; no; the gentlewoman must use the correct word. The VA did not close down anything; they just decided they would not open additional beds. The gentlewoman is right in the fact that there was no excuse for Brockton, because testimony in the subcommittee indicates that the beds we need are in NP hospitals, and Brockton is an NP hospital.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; but they did plan to have a certain number of surgical beds eliminated. They closed them down and now they were not allowing them to expand.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. I might say that in St. Louis recently we completed a 500-bed hospital there, but 175 of the beds are not being used because of inadequate funds.

Mr. PHILLIPS. No; no; that is not correct.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. That is the information that I received from the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I beg pardon for taking the gentlewoman's time, but no money was asked for them. That is a

general medical and surgical hospital. No money was asked for those beds. We are now told that we have appropriated inadequate funds. We did not—that is not the case. We appropriated exactly the amount that was to have all the beds occupied, which could be properly occupied. Furthermore, we changed the formula from the beds activated to the beds occupied. Furthermore, we put together hospitals, domiciliaries, and the contract beds so that the accounting would be easier to handle. Remember we are not talking about service-connected veterans, we are talking about non-service-connected veterans' cases.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. We are talking about hospital beds, if I remember what the gentlewoman said. We are talking about empty hospital beds. I just wonder whether or not there are any funds in this bill to enable the Veterans' Administration to use those beds.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is going to make certain surveys just as soon as the Congress adjourns, and we may have some further information regarding the hospitals and secure added funds.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. It is ridiculous to build a hospital and not use it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. YATES. May I state, I think the chairman of my subcommittee, the gentleman from California, will agree with me on this that our committee, our appropriations subcommittee has given the Veterans' Administration all the funds it has requested for the care of the veterans. But the difficulty seems to be with the Bureau of the Budget.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further on that because I want the additional time myself. It is not always the fault of the Bureau of the Budget. Take the case of the \$8 million recommended by the Veterans' Administration and heartily endorsed by the Budget Bureau that the Senate placed in the independent offices bill and which later the conferees cut to \$3,500,000. The Budget Bureau told me emphatically that they believed this Veterans' Administration facility could not function properly without the full \$8 million.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I remind the gentleman from California that when the additional \$8 million asked for the additions to the Long Beach facility was provided for, I was heartily in favor of that. The Senate put it in the bill and the House agreed to it.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman if I have the additional time.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to point out with regard to the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fort Hamilton in Brooklyn, N. Y., that that facility is only four-fifths occupied, that there are about 200 vacant beds which could be used, and should be used, but no funds have been provided for them because the Veterans' Administration has not asked for the money. I thank the distinguished gentlewoman for yielding for this observation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. A survey is being made of the Fort Hamilton hospital, may I point out to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time only to complete the statement I was trying to make before, and that is that our Appropriation Subcommittee has granted every dollar the Veterans' Administration has asked of us for medical care. Much of the difficulty seems to be in the Bureau of the Budget, which cuts down the requests made by the Veterans' Administration. When the VA gets to our committee, in complying with the rule of the Bureau of the Budget, it can request only the amount the Budget Bureau allows.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Does the gentleman mean that the Bureau of the Budget places its judgment above the judgment of the Congress in withholding that money; could the gentleman tell us that?

Mr. YATES. Apparently. I, for one, would like to see the Bureau of the Budget take a more sympathetic approach to this problem than it has taken in the past.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. It is not the intention of the Department, but that is exactly what this body is doing in withholding these funds.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Has the gentleman from Illinois any hope that the Bureau of the Budget would extend sympathetic consideration?

Mr. YATES. With the passage of time there is always hope that those who are remorseful will be able to mend their ways.

Mr. PHILLIPS. If the gentleman will yield, I have very high regard for the gentleman. I think he is attempting to cover the subject well, but that he overlooked something, and that is that both last year and this year our committee, disregarding the request of the Bureau of the Budget, asked the Veterans' Administration to give us a figure for the number of beds which they could occupy and for the amount of money that the Veterans' Administration needed to take care of that additional bed capacity. Thus, disregarding the Bureau of the Budget, we took the actual statement, which appears in the hearings, from the Veterans' Administration and which

they said they needed, and we gave them that amount.

This \$3 million to which the gentleman from Massachusetts calls attention is in addition to that, and in addition to the money which the Veterans' Administration itself said they needed when they came before us.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman is correct; we provided all the money the VA requested. However the gentleman will recall that when we held hearings on the supplemental appropriation bill there were two people present from the Bureau of the Budget who tried to justify their action in cutting down the request made for medical care, they said they were trying to hold medical care to the minimum.

As the gentleman will recall, I pressed them as to why they proposed to hold medical care to the minimum rather than give the veterans the same good medical care they had been receiving.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not going to make any statement that appears to be in controversy of the subcommittee, because I remember well what the gentleman from California said, and I am not forgetful of it. I received indications recently from the Veterans' Administration Hospital in Brockton, Mass.—probably the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] did also, as well as others—that there was a certain part of the hospital that could not be used due to the lack of help and the failure to appropriate money to hire the help.

Mr. YATES. As far as I am concerned, the VA was completely wrong in its handling of the Brockton situation.

The Clerk read as follows:

For an additional amount for "Forest Roads and Trails," \$6,500,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GAVIN: On page 9, line 14, after the word "expended", insert "\$150,000 of which shall be allocated to Allegheny National Forest, Pa."

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not increase the appropriation; it merely allocates a certain part, \$150,000 of the \$6,500,000 appropriation, for forest roads and trails in the Allegheny National Forest in Pennsylvania.

I would say that in the Allegheny National Forest with an area of some 750,000 acres, that is used extensively by millions of people, there has been for some time evident need for roads and forest trails. It qualifies under this category of funds for access roads in these national forests and the necessity for roads where overmature timber needs harvesting. I certainly hope that the chairman of the subcommittee, with whom I have fully discussed this matter, will take a favorable attitude toward this amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I may say that the gentleman from Pennsylvania did approach me on this matter and that I agreed not to oppose it.

Mr. GAVIN. Well, I understood when I talked to the gentleman that he would accept the amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I told the gentleman I would not enter any objection to it, and I stand by that.

Mr. GAVIN. My original request, I may say, was for \$300,000 and the gentleman said if that were brought down to \$150,000 he would accept the amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. At no time did I say I would accept the amendment, to the best of my remembrance. I said I would not object to the amendment if the gentleman would reduce the amount to \$150,000.

Mr. GAVIN. The fact is this is not asking for an additional appropriation. Merely that \$150,000 of the \$6,500,000 be designated for roads and trails in the Allegheny National Forest.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HAGEN of California. What justification does the gentleman present for this exact amount of money? It is that so many employees have to be hired?

Mr. GAVIN. Definitely not. Why should the gentleman from California be concerned? California is receiving, according to the hearing, \$4 million. Permit me to continue. I feel this great Allegheny National Forest area in Pennsylvania is in need of forest roads and trails. In view of the fact that in the hearings it is all specified where the money is to be allocated, the appropriations to the various States, it is my opinion, my amendment was very much in order. I note that California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana are specified and also that Minnesota is specified definitely for \$300,000 of the \$600,000 allocated to the eastern part of the United States.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is an incorrect statement and I am sure the gentleman is making it unintentionally. He does not understand the situation correctly.

Mr. GAVIN. That is what it says here.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I say to the gentleman it merely brings out the tentative allocation as to where the Forest Service might use this money provided that the entire \$13 million was made available. They have indicated that \$300,000 would be made available to the lake States.

Mr. GAVIN. Yes. That is correct.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That includes Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. They have also indicated that if they had the full \$13 million made available to them they would make \$300,000 available also for the entire eastern part of the United States. That is the situation. I would not want the gentleman to place me in the position of trying to earmark anything for Minnesota because there is not anything in here earmarked for Minnesota.

Mr. GAVIN. I do not know except what I read. It states \$300,000 would be

made available in the Lake States, mainly Wisconsin and Minnesota. Now, I do not know whether that indicates \$300,000 is for Minnesota. It states—and I quote—page 523, about \$300,000 of that would be in Lake States, mainly in Superior country and Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Remember that the committee did not allow this additional \$6½ million. Consequently, even that \$600,000 we are now referring to may not even be available.

Mr. GAVIN. Now, just a minute. I have the floor, Mr. Chairman. I want to be patient with the gentleman; however, he is talking on my time.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I again say to the gentleman that the allocation upon which this was based—that is, tentatively—is upon the fact that the Appropriations Subcommittee would give the full \$13 million for this purpose; but we only actually gave the \$6½ million. I doubt whether there will be \$300,000 available for the Lake States or \$300,000 available for the eastern United States. I do not object personally, however, to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GAVIN. I may say to the gentleman that I am rather surprised at the turn of the debate here because of the fact I talked to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] about the allocation of \$150,000 for the Allegheny National Forest, and he acquiesced; I talked to the gentleman from Minnesota, and he acquiesced. I talked to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], and he acquiesced. Now, all we are asking is that a great forest area in Pennsylvania that provides recreation facilities for millions of people from New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio be allocated \$150,000 for this area so that this forest area may be properly utilized.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. Is the gentleman ready to accept the amendment?

Mr. ROONEY. I am in this position, I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I was called to answer a telephone in the cloakroom and now find that he is about to do something in regard to funds in the Treasury, and I wonder whether or not that Punxsutawney groundhog was heard from. Is there anything in this request to keep that hog alive until next year?

Mr. GAVIN. I might say to the gentleman I am glad he brought up that matter of the Punxsutawney groundhog, that great world-renowned prognosticator of the weather.

Mr. ROONEY. I wonder how he would prognosticate as to the outcome of this amendment.

Mr. GAVIN. Knowing the temper of the House, I believe it would be inadvisable for me to expatiate in extenso

on this world-renowned meteorologist at this time.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman is to be congratulated on his statement. We, in Ohio, enjoy this forest and need this additional facility, and I want to say that since the gentleman is being so tranquil and agreeable and so gentle, I am sure there is no opposition and I do not know why we should continue this debate. Why not grant him this request?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I must admit that his oratorical outburst has convinced me of the worthiness of his proposed amendment, and I have no objection to it.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to thank my distinguished friends, because there are times, when these various legislative proposals are before the House, that one must rise with statesmanlike qualities to meet the issues, and I am glad to know the gentleman from New York will accept the amendment.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, our committee went over this bill very thoroughly and recommended an additional \$6.5 million, which makes the full authorization of \$22.5 million available to the Forest Service for forest roads and trails in our national forests in fiscal year 1955. I think it is bad precedent here on the floor to start earmarking these funds to specific forests without any real justification and without testimony being presented as to the need in a particular forest for roads and trails. The funds made available here are made available largely for the construction of access roads to harvest overmature and insect-infested timber which does exist in many of our national forests throughout the country. It is important from the standpoint of the economy of our country and for good forest management to harvest this timber as it matures or becomes infested with insects. It certainly seems to me that we should go along with the judgment of the Forest Service in using these funds in the places where they are most needed. I sincerely hope that the House will not go along with the principle of earmarking these funds for a particular forest in a particular State where there has been no justification brought to our committee and no justification established in our hearings that this particular forest should take precedence in the construction of roads over some other forest where there may be mature timber. I oppose this amendment without prejudice to the particular forest involved. It is entirely possible that some of the funds available in fiscal year 1955 will be expended in this forest.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. I would like to concur with my colleague from Wisconsin and say it substantiates the fact that

not one word has come up from the Forest Service or the Bureau of the Budget expressing the need for roads and trails in this specific area. We have acted on the recommendation of the Forest Service, and in acting that way we have tried to make funds available to them that will take care of the situation. Now, as to the funds made available, testimony was presented to us that the Federal Government, over a 4-year period, is going to get back \$1.50 for each dollar that they are spending on these roads.

There is not one bit of substantiation of the claim that any such situation exists in the Allegheny National Forest. We, in our committee, are interested in all of the forests. But if we get to the point in this House of trying to earmark little dabs here and there all over the country, for forest roads and trails, it will be an unending process. I want the House to know that we, on this side of the aisle, do not like that kind of legislative procedure, and I hope that the committee will see fit in its wisdom to reject the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] for his statement. I concur in it. I do feel we would be setting a very bad precedent in earmarking these funds for forest roads and trails to specific national forests throughout the country. The funds are limited when compared to the vast job which must be done. Let us direct the Forest Service take care of the areas of greatest need.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GAVIN) there were—ayes 34, noes 45.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For an additional amount for "Construction," \$3,900,000, to remain available until expended, and the limitation under this heading in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1955, on the amount available for personnel services is increased by \$1 million.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RHODES of Arizona: On page 10, line 7, strike out "\$3,900,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$6,900,000"; and on page 10, line 8, after the word "expended" insert the following: "which sum is composed of \$3 million to provide financial assistance to public school districts, including advance payments, for the construction and equipment of public school facilities for Navaho Indian children from reservation areas not included in such districts, and \$3,900,000 for payments under contracts or other obligations entered into pursuant to section 6 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1954 (38 Stat. 73)."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Arizona desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I would say that I disagree with the gentleman from

Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL]. I do not believe it is legislation on an appropriation bill. The purpose of the amendment is to carry on work which is in furtherance of the Navaho-Hopi Rehabilitation Act.

If I may be heard for just a moment, I have an opinion from the Solicitor of the Interior Department, to which I should like to refer.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I think the entire amendment is subject to point of order, especially that language in the amendment reading, "including advance payments for instruction or equipment." There is no authorization like that anywhere in the law. Therefore, I ask that the entire matter be deleted.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. May I be heard further, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Can the gentleman cite the law applying to this particular question?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Section 1 of the Navaho-Hopi Rehabilitation Act of April 19, 1950 (64 Stat. 44, 25 U. S. C. 631), provides as follows:

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to undertake, within the limits of funds from time to time appropriated pursuant to this act, a program of basic improvements for . . . the supplying of means to be used in their rehabilitation, whether on or off the Navaho and Hopi Reservations. Such programs shall include the following projects for which capital expenditures in the amount shown after each project . . . are authorized to be appropriated. . . .

(12) School buildings and equipment, and other educational measures, \$25 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The point before the Chair is the provision "including advance payments." Where in the law is that phrase shown, "including advance payments"?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike from the amendment the words "including advance payments."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I hate to object, but I am so strongly opposed to the amendment, feeling that it is entirely out of order, that I am going to have to object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Chair is ready to rule.

In the opinion of the Chair, the words "including advance payments" are legislation, since there is no provision in law for them. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment:

Page 10, line 7, strike out "\$3,900,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$6,900,000."

Page 10, line 8, after the word "expended," insert the following: "which sum is composed of \$3,000,000 to provide financial assistance to public-school districts, for the construction and equipment of public-school facilities for Navaho Indian children from reservation areas not included in such districts, and \$3,900,000 for payments under contracts or other obligations entered into pursuant to section 6 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1954 (38 Stat. 73)."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the

amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman point out where in the modified amendment is the language to which he refers as legislation?

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, there is no law anywhere that I have been able to find authorizing the Interior Department to take this amount of money, \$3 million, and do what they are proposing to do under this amendment, to wit, assist the schools throughout certain areas in making improvements on the physical property in order the Indian children may come there and go to school in the years to follow. There is money to help rehabilitate the Indians and the Indian children, but there is no authorization anywhere which would give the Indian Service the authority to make the kind of a contract which it is proposed to make by this amendment to improve physical properties so that the Indians may go to school there in the years to come. There is just no law in the statute books as far as I have been able to find to warrant that kind of appropriation.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, may I invite the attention of the Chair to the language in the proposed amendment which relates to payments to school districts. The original act, which the gentleman from Arizona has cited as being authority for his amendment so far as I have been able to find does not provide anything about the United States Government making payments to school districts. So for that reason, I think the amendment is obviously legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, may I also call the attention of the Chairman to the fact that the Johnson-O'Malley Act authorizes the Secretary to carry out this authority under the educational provisions of the Navaho-Hopi Rehabilitation Act by appropriate contracts with State agencies. I cannot see that this would be any different matter than the matters authorized under the Johnson-O'Malley Act which comes under the Navaho-Hopi Rehabilitation Act. In other words, there is authority in the Navaho-Hopi Act to contract with the States, and certainly, in my opinion, the Navaho-Hopi Rehabilitation Act contains ample authority for the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, may I be recognized further on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I have examined the law under which we are operating here. There is no authorization whereby the money can be paid to a district as is proposed by the amendment. It has never been done. We have never established such a practice. They have never asked for such a law. I say it is not in the organic law or any other law that I have been able to find. There is no authority in the law for the school districts to make these payments.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ALLEN of Illinois). The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair has examined the Rehabilitation Act of the Indian tribes and feels that it is broad enough to cover the amendment. In title 25 of the United States Code, where the Navaho and Hopi Rehabilitation Act is codified, section 631 authorizes a broad program of rehabilitation, expressly including "school buildings and equipment, and other educational measures" and funds appropriated for such purposes are authorized to be available "for all other objects necessary for or appropriate to the carrying out of the provisions of this section." Section 452 of title 25 of the United States Code authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to contract with States or subdivisions thereof for the education of Indians. Therefore, the appropriation set forth in the amendment in the opinion of the Chair is authorized by law, and the point of order is overruled.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment at this particular time because of the press of time to complete what will probably be the largest program of educating Indians ever undertaken in the United States. May I state here and now I am personally grateful to the members of the subcommittee and the Committee on Appropriations for the fine attitude which they have had, and for the money which they have appropriated to carry this program along thus far. There is money in the act for the program, but there is not enough for \$3 million. That is the reason for this particular amendment. We find that there were some 14,000 Navaho children of school age who are not in school at the present time. This is in spite of the fact that over the last few years we have spent several million dollars to provide educational facilities for Indian children on the Navaho Reservation. After we had spent the money there were actually more children out of school than there were before we began to spend those large sums of money.

So Mr. Carl Beck, a resident of Arizona, now employed by the Indian Bureau, Mr. Orme Lewis, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, also a resident of Arizona, and Mr. Glenn L. Emmons, the Director of the Indian Bureau, from the State of New Mexico, men who understand the Navaho problem, came up with this idea of bringing real education to the Navaho children, rather than trying to give those children the lush but ineffectual program which had been launched before.

The Navaho Reservation is the largest Indian reservation of any in the country; it is larger than many of our Eastern States. The Indians wander over the reservation. Therefore if a child is near a school he goes to the school, but if the child's family, at the time the particular school is in session, is in another part of the reservation, then the child does not go to school.

The first element of the program, therefore, was to take trailer schools to these Indian children; to the habitat of the parents of the Indian children. This program has been launched. It will result in the education of some 3,000 or

4,000 of these Indian children who would not otherwise have schooling.

This, however, is not the answer to the whole problem. The communities surrounding the Navaho Reservation were asked, and they agreed to admit Indian children to white school systems provided some help can be given them to take care of this increased impact on their schools.

Many of these cities are small. The city of Winslow, Ariz., has a population somewhere around 4,000 to 5,000 people. The city of Flagstaff, Ariz., has a population of around 10,000 people. The city of Gallup, N. Mex., has a population of under 25,000. To take this many children and put them in these school systems would cause hardship which those communities could not afford to bear. It therefore becomes necessary for the Federal Government to step in and help these communities meet this problem.

Why should we do it? Because, Mr. Chairman, we have a solemn obligation to the Navaho Indians, to educate those children. We have promised by treaty down through the years to provide education for the Navaho children. This solemn obligation of the United States Government has never been met, and this is one way to meet it.

These communities are now willing and able to construct these additional facilities and to take the Navaho children. A year from now they may not be so willing and able to do it.

These plans are ready to go into operation and are ready to go into operation now; in fact, I may be so bold as to say there have been some commitments made which might be embarrassing to a lot of well-intentioned people if this particular money is not made available.

We are at the crossroads in this Navaho picture. We are either going to go forward now or we are going to go backward for several years.

The answer to the Indian problem—and I do not like to call it a problem—it is a problem of all Americans, because the Navahos and all Indians are some of the finest Americans that we have. This problem will be settled only by educating the Indian children. We must take the Indian children into the schools and give them the type of education which will allow them to fit themselves into the civilization with which they are now surrounded but of which they are not a part. The best way to do it is to bring these children into the white schools so that they will be able to rub elbows with your children and my children; and, believe me, I think the experience will enrich not only the Indian children, but also the white children, because the Indians not only have a lot to receive but also a lot to give.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to enjoy one bit the responsibility of opposing the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona because I know of his great and sincere interest in the Indians and the Indian problem, particularly in getting these Indian children into schools. Every member of the committee that

deals with appropriations for the Department of the Interior has worked diligently and we have leaned over backward in appropriating money for Indian education, especially during the present session.

We have \$11 million in the regular bill for the education of Indian children. I am happy to report that about half of the Indian children who have been out of school, in fact have never been in school, will be in school during the fiscal year 1955. That may be a rather broad statement because of the fact that a \$3 million appropriation might have been considered when Mr. Emmons, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, gave us the facts and figures at which time he said that he would put half of the 13,000 Indian children who are not in school, in school in the fiscal year 1955.

Mr. Chairman, here is the thing that disturbs the committee. It is not only the fact that we are here embarking into strange fields because of the fact that never before has a Congress seen fit to appropriate money to build school facilities outside of Indian territory and in public-school districts for the education of the Indians. It is true that the Congress has on an occasion or two passed specific bills for this purpose. But it is rather out of the ordinary to ask for \$3 million for this purpose. Just where we would end up is questionable. There are many other Indian reservations that might say: We would like to have some money appropriated to build a school right outside of our territory where our children can go to school.

So you just do not know where the end is when you start a thing of this kind.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Is it not true, however, that under this particular amendment the only authorizing legislation is the Navaho-Hopi rehabilitation bill and if the other tribes desired to come in under this type of formula it would be necessary for them to have the same sort of authorizing legislation passed by the Congress?

Mr. JENSEN. That is true. But the fact is that we are attempting to do something that is very questionable in the minds of the attorneys on the committee as to whether it is authorized by law and whether or not this is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The question is a difficult one to square with your heartbeat when you want to do everything you possibly can to get the Indian children in schools and on the other hand avoid doing something that is not authorized by law, something that might result in a flood of requests that would not be good for the Indians or anyone else.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to oppose my very able friend the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], a man whom I have learned to admire a great deal since he has been here with us. I also hate to oppose this amendment because of the good it would bring to a

number of school districts in the West. There are 9 districts all told that will benefit if this amendment is adopted: 1 in Colorado, 3 in New Mexico, 1 in Utah, and 4 in Arizona.

But the proposal here is this: They want to begin this program by expending \$3 million on schools now that are owned and operated by the people in these several States outside of the Indian reservations. We have never done that. The committee has tried to go along with these Indian schools in every conceivable way down through the years. I have been on this subcommittee now for probably 15 long years, and there has never been a time when our committee was not anxious, ready, and willing to do anything and everything possible for the benefit of the Indians. The record will show that. But to present a program like this in a supplemental budget that will start a new and entirely different program from what we have had down through the years is not the way to do it, when we have heretofore allowed every dollar that the Indian Service requested for Indian education in the regular budget estimates. This money, if allowed, will start a new program that, if started, will run into millions and millions and millions of dollars. Who knows whether or not the Indian children can even then attend these schools? I say we ought not to go into this program hastily. You ought not to go into it in opposition to the subcommittee that has been so good, I believe, and so generous and so interested in the welfare of the Indians.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I would just like to say to the gentleman from Arkansas that I agree with him in everything that he has said concerning the treatment the Indians have received from his subcommittee. I cannot be too high in my praise of his subcommittee for the way they have attempted to carry on this program. But I am sure from what the gentleman has said that he agrees with me that this is a very vital part of the program and that the only disagreement between us is a very honest difference of opinion as to the legal authorization of this appropriation.

Mr. NORRELL. That is substantially true, I will say to the gentleman. But, may I say this? This is a question that is so big, it is so important, it is so far reaching, that you ought to have a bill introduced to this effect. The legislative committee ought to hold hearings. It ought to decide what the policy should be. The legislative committee should come in then with a bill to do what they honestly and sincerely think should be done after mature consideration, and the Congress then can consider the bill, and enact a law and authorize the expenditure of money, and when that is done your Committee on Appropriations can recommend the money, and the Congress can then decide what should be done. But, to start it without the authorizing legislation, when it eventually

may run into millions and millions of dollars, is not the way to do it. I say we ought not to launch a program of such magnitude without additional study. And I say it in all kindness to the Indians and to the gentleman from Arizona.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 21, noes 37.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For an additional amount for "Construction and rehabilitation," \$1,707,000, to remain available until expended, and the limitations under this heading in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1955, on the amount available for personal services and travel are increased by \$2,500,000 and \$200,000, respectively: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate construction of the Helena Valley unit, Montana, until a repayment contract has been executed.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YOUNG: On page 10, line 15, after "rehabilitation" strike out "\$1,707,000" and insert "\$1,807,000, of which \$100,000 shall be for construction of a sewage plant at the Boulder Canyon project."

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would appropriate \$100,000 for the construction of a sewage disposal plant at Hoover Dam.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a fair request. I have no objection to this amendment.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-two Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. JENSEN. If the gentleman will yield to me, as I stated, Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to this amendment. I think this is a worthy cause. This is for a very necessary facility in Boulder City. At the time the committee had its hearings the committee had not heard about this sewage problem at Boulder City. The gentleman from Nevada [Mr. YOUNG] came to me and explained the situation and I took the gentleman's word for it, as he is a fine, a truthful, and an honorable gentleman. I certainly have no objection to this amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. As I understand the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], he is accepting this amendment. I should like to ask if he speaks for himself or if he speaks for that side of the aisle.

Mr. JENSEN. I said that I had no objection. I am speaking for myself. But I have not heard a single person over on this side that knows about this matter that has objected.

Mr. GAVIN. Here is one that wants to be heard.

Mr. JENSEN. Except the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN], that had that disappointment a minute ago, for which we are very sorry; but those things happen. So I am sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] would not take his spite out on the fine gentleman who offered this amendment. I do not want to shut off debate or consideration of this amendment, but I stated before that I felt this amendment was really justified for the purpose for which it is intended. As far as I know, no member of my Committee on Interior Appropriations has any objection to the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will yield, was this question brought before the subcommittee and the whole committee which reported out this bill?

Mr. JENSEN. No.

Mr. CANNON. It is a proposal to insert an amendment here on the floor without hearings, without consideration and without the approval of either the subcommittee or the whole committee?

Mr. JENSEN. No, it did not just come right out of the blue sky. It is one of these things where, after the committee had considered its regular bill and the supplemental bill, this condition arose in Boulder City.

Mr. CANNON. Did the Department ask for this?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes, the Department of the Interior did request this, for \$100,000.

Mr. CANNON. Was it included in the budget?

Mr. YOUNG. It was not included in the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. CANNON. I take it for granted the gentleman from Iowa speaks for the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

Mr. TABER. Frankly, I know nothing about this proposition. For my own part, I would not want to favor a matter that had not been brought before the committee and had had hearings.

Mr. CANNON. I should think that would be conclusive, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JENSEN. May I say that under the Boulder Canyon Act all expenditures of this nature are in an account and every 3 years, I think it is, the rates are raised to pay all of these expenditures which Congress makes that go into a certain category, this being one of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nevada has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. JENSEN) Mr. YOUNG was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. YOUNG. I yield further to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. So we are not spending a dime of the taxpayers' money that will not be reimbursed. I do not think I can be accused of being a spendthrift or of being liberal with the people's money.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KIRWAN. I do not think we should agree to amendments as a committee or as the House. What is the matter that they did not take it up? Here is a supplemental appropriation bill. This item was not in the supplemental bill and it was not in the regular bill. Why should they come up here today and want to put it in the supplemental bill on the floor of the House?

Mr. YOUNG. I might explain to the distinguished gentleman that I had hoped it would be inserted on the other side of the Hill. I did not want to impose on the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Interior Department. As soon as the consideration had been completed on the other side of the Hill, I contacted the subcommittee clerk in an effort to appear and testify, and was notified that the hearings had been terminated.

Mr. KIRWAN. The gentleman from Nevada does not mean to tell me that if this thing was so urgent, the great Department of the Interior would not have had a bill in asking for a supplemental appropriation. Just think of what we are doing. We not only passed the regular bill, but we are letting them come up and putting in everything that they think they need whenever they want it.

Mr. YOUNG. It had been submitted by the Department of the Interior, but it was deleted by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. KIRWAN. No matter who deleted it, this is the first time that we know anything about it. The chairman of this committee said that he found out about it yesterday. I, as ranking minority member, did not find out about it until the gentleman from Nevada went down into the well of the House and spoke about it. I again say, if it was so important, surely the Department of the Interior or somebody connected with that Department would have told either the chairman of this committee or me that this thing was needed down at Hoover Dam because that is a great dam. But nobody said a word about it. I do think it could wait until next year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nevada has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. If the gentleman would yield, I would like to read to the committee the language in the conference report with reference to the Interior Department regular appropriation bill, Boulder Canyon project, Arizona-Nevada:

The attention of the committee has been directed to an unsanitary condition at Hoover Dam, resulting from the lack of adequate sewerage disposal facilities. The committee urges that this matter be looked into with the view in mind of presenting a budget estimate to correct the situation in the fiscal year 1956.

Is it not a fact that a study has been made and the Department of the Interior has now recommended that this

money be made available to repair this sewerage system?

Mr. YOUNG. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given 5 additional minutes so that he can explain the project in which he is interested. I, as a member of the committee, know nothing about it, and I would like to hear the gentleman explain it. If it is a worthy project, I want to be for it. I certainly do not want anything to happen here as just happened when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] offered an amendment a while ago. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would appropriate \$100,000 for the construction of a sewage-disposal plant located in the Boulder Canyon project. When Hoover Dam was constructed, it represented, perhaps, the outstanding reclamation achievement up to that time. But there was one serious omission. It did not include a sewage-disposal system. As a consequence, the raw, untreated sewage from the restrooms and facilities at Boulder Dam is discharged directly into the Colorado River and into Lake Mohave, the upper region of which extends to the tailraces of Hoover Dam. At the time the dam was constructed that was not a serious problem. But since that time the Lake Mead recreational area has become one of the greatest attractions in the national park system. It ranks third on the basis of the number of visitors who come there each year. Nearly three times as many people as live in the District of Columbia visit Lake Mead recreational area each year. It is estimated that between 1 million to 1,500,000 visitors come annually to the dam. Of that figure, it is estimated that one-third take the conducted guided tour through the dam itself. There have been reports for a number of years on the stream of pollution that is resulting therefrom. The Public Health Service and the Federal Government investigated. It has been brought to the attention of the Arizona State Health Department and the Nevada State Health Department. It violates the laws and regulations of both States. It also contravenes an Executive order of the Federal Government which directs Federal agencies to cooperate with States in controlling interstate pollution in streams such as this.

We have received several complaints from those who visit and use the recreational facilities in that area, particularly in what is called Lake Mohave. Last year nearly 100,000 people used this rather narrow lake for the purpose of fishing and boating.

Since 1951 monthly tests have been made by the National Park Service in conjunction with the State health departments of Nevada and Arizona which

indicate that in the vast majority of cases the water is polluted.

It is necessary that something be done at the earliest possible date to abate this potentially serious menace. It is difficult to spend money. I think we should, however, bear in mind the fact that Hoover Dam has been one of the finest investments which the Federal Government has ever made. It returns approximately \$800,000 a month to the Federal exchequer. By 1951 it had returned some \$65 million. By 1987 it will have returned \$130 million on the original investment plus \$130 million in interest. After that time it will undertake the somewhat unusual task of paying back some \$25 million which was allocated to flood control benefits.

Within this national recreation area are located a number of concessionaires. The Government imposes rather strict conditions upon the sewage disposal facilities of those concessions. Unfortunately, however, the same standard does not apply to the dam itself.

It is estimated that the sewage which is untreated going into Lake Mohave is the equivalent roughly to that of a city of some 1,500 people. I feel that this proposal should not be delayed, because a serious health menace exists.

I urge the House to adopt this amendment.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations I object to this amendment. When this dam was constructed Mr. Hoover was President of the United States, and they have just now discovered down there that they need better sewage facilities—after all those years.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The gentleman must realize that tourists have increased to the extent that today 2½ million come to this area. When the dam was constructed there were relatively few who were attracted to the vicinity.

Mr. KIRWAN. Let me tell the gentleman he has not seen anything yet. We have a six-State pact along the Ohio River where the sewage of all those great cities goes into the Ohio River from not 1 but from 6 States. They are going to try to do something to clean up that situation.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Have those cities paid \$800,000 a month into the Federal Treasury such as is the case with Hoover Dam?

Mr. KIRWAN. That is all right. States along the Ohio have put up their money, the taxpayers' money, to have help.

A supplemental bill is not the place to add new items of this type. That can be taken care of in the regular bill.

I will say to the everlasting credit of Calvin Coolidge that he was firm in his desire to save money. An Army general told me that when he first came to Washington he served in the capacity

of a captain and had occasion to go to the White House when Calvin Coolidge was President. Coolidge asked him what the Army engineers needed to take care of them for the next year and then told him that he would take care of them, but that unless something like an act of God or the breaking of a dam or something like that occurred for them not to go near Congress in the coming year or if they did it would be the end of them.

Now, this item is brought here in the form of an amendment to a supplemental bill, coming here as a new item. The place where that should be taken care of is in the regular bill.

We will never get through if item after item is sought to be added to supplemental bills which must be brought up in the closing days of Congress—and we are now in them. This is not the place for such an item.

Mr. YOUNG. This is in the nature of an emergency.

Mr. KIRWAN. An emergency? It has been down there for about 30 years.

Mr. YOUNG. That is true.

Mr. KIRWAN. We have six States up here where there is something like fifty million. It is an emergency that we have.

Mr. YOUNG. That is not a responsibility of the Federal Government.

Mr. KIRWAN. It is not a responsibility of the Federal Government? Who does the gentleman think controls the Ohio River except the Federal Government?

Mr. YOUNG. Is that not a responsibility of the States involved? Hoover Dam is a Federal responsibility. If it were a State problem, I would not be here.

Mr. KIRWAN. It is a responsibility of the Federal Government and the six States. They all have a piece of it. If they can stand it down there in Arizona or Nevada for all this time, they can surely stand it until we come back into session again.

Mr. YOUNG. We probably will put off a lot of appropriations until that time; but this is an urgent matter. We have received protests from the Arizona State Health Department, the Nevada State Health Department, and the Public Health Service of the Federal Government. It is a direct responsibility of the Federal Government. This is located entirely within a Federal reserve area.

Mr. KIRWAN. If they can stand it all of these years they can stand it a little longer. I have been down there to the Hoover Dam and I am telling you it is nothing at all like the river that goes through my town or any river up North here, or to the South or anywhere in the country. The Hoover Dam has 50 miles of water backed up there, it has a 600-foot depth up against that dam. Why they could almost purify half of the water of the United States.

Mr. YOUNG. This is not Lake Mead.

Mr. KIRWAN. I understand about Lake Mead and all that. I am trying to tell the gentleman that the water he has there is purified.

Mr. YOUNG. But we do not have the money.

Mr. KIRWAN. This is not so urgent, it is not needed right now. It will surely last until next year. As a member of the subcommittee, I will be happy when the Department comes in front of the committee and states this is needed to consider it. They have never done that. So it cannot be so urgent or they would have done that long ago.

Mr. YOUNG. They have requested it. Mr. KIRWAN. But they never got it in front of the committee.

Mr. YOUNG. I think they were restricted from doing so.

Mr. KIRWAN. It did not get in front of the committee and if it is urgent it will get there.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for an additional 4 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, getting back to the matter of allocation of funds for Allegheny National Forest, I might state to the gentleman who preceded me that I was almost in the same position that he is in. The only thing I did that he did not do was that I conferred with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and fully discussed this matter, in view of the fact I had not had the opportunity to appear before the committee. And I might say that the committee members look after themselves very well as it concerns their States. If some of us Members were apprised that these hearings were being held we would have had an opportunity to go before the committee to present our case, but it is difficult with the many matters before us to get to committee hearings; especially when we do not know when the hearings are to be held.

So I spoke to the gentleman from Iowa. As a matter of fact, I spoke to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] first, then to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]. He suggested that I talk to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]. Both of these gentlemen are here, so if there is any mistake in what I say, just rise and I will yield.

I said: It looks as though this \$22,500,000 is pretty well allocated. I noted there was only \$600,000 out of the \$22,500,000 going to the eastern part of the country and out of that \$600,000 that great State of Minnesota, and it is a great State—the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] is here—got half of it, \$300,000. So immediately I was concerned about the eastern part of the United States and what States were to participate in the \$300,000 unallocated.

In my district we have the Allegheny National Forest consisting of 750,000 acres with no roads, no trails; practically no improvements in roads and trails for years. Millions of people use this area. They are from the States of New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania, and other States of the Union.

So, I got to thinking, "Well, we are entitled to something out of the \$22.5 million when my State pays between 8 and

10 percent of the tax. This appropriation costs my State some \$2 million. We have a great forest, and it needs roads and trails." In reading the report it states on page 523, "So we would propose to obligate about \$4 million in California." I presume that Oregon and Washington and Idaho and Montana would receive balance with the exception of \$600,000 for eastern United States. Some of these States I believe have about the same population in their whole State as I have in my district. It is all right for Pennsylvania to put up the money, to furnish the money, to make these programs possible, so once in a while I like to think "Well, maybe they will be reasonable and give us just a little bit." So I made request of \$300,000 to be allocated for Pennsylvania. I thought that was small to help develop this great recreational area, the Allegheny National Forest. But, Ben [Mr. JENSEN] said, "Cut it down a little. Make it \$250,000." I cut it down as he recommended. So I went to Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, and he said, "No. I would suggest \$100,000 but no more." Then I sweated it out for 24 hours and I went back to Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN requesting another \$50,000, and he said "\$150,000 will be all right. I will agree to that." So I said, "I will agree to \$150,000. That will be satisfactory." But he said, "You have to see WALT HORAN, and if he [Mr. HORAN] and Ben agree, there will be no argument about it at all. We will accept it." That would have given to the Allegheny National Forest \$150,000 out of \$22,500,000, and my State pays \$2 million of it. So we would be getting back \$150,000 which, though not satisfactory, I agreed to. But, the boys from the Northwest and the West say, "Oh, no. You have got to give it all out here," although my State has 10 million people and there are millions of people using this forest area, and we would like to participate in these programs. But they say, "Oh, no. We have got to get this mature timber out, and we have to develop roads and trails out here in California and the Rocky Mountain States." So, all right. Then, after I was all set on that side, I thought I would go over and have a talk with the Democrats about it. So, I went to see my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio, MIKE KIRWAN, and he is my good friend, a great American and a great conservationist who believes unselfishly in building and protecting the great national forests, our waterways and streams, and protecting our wildlife—and he said, "I concur with you. I think you are right; but I am not chairman of the subcommittee." He said, "You go and see the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]." Well, I thought I would do this preliminary work, and I saw Mr. WHITTEN and he said, "Oh, sure. Certainly." He is here, and if I make a mistake, please say so, because I do not want to be misquoting, and that goes for you gentlemen, too. So, Mr. WHITTEN said, "I will interpose no objection." So, Mr. WHITTEN was not here and Mr. ROONEY was in charge, and I told Mr. ROONEY what Mr. WHITTEN had said, and I did not anticipate any trouble about my pro-

posal. But then, evidently somebody gave the cue to the young gentleman from Wisconsin who just came into Congress to get up and vigorously object, which he did, so the result was that those that I talked to failed to arise to support the amendment even though they had given me the assurance it was acceptable. What was the gentleman's name that just preceded me?—Mr. YOUNG, and he made a very fine statement and I want to compliment him, but, Mr. YOUNG, you did better than I did, because I could not get Mr. JENSEN to arise in behalf of my amendment. And Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, who agreed with me and was going along for \$150,000, he would not rise, either. They were all hogtied down there. Something held them down. So, the amendment was turned down.

Now, the only thing I have to say is this: I think the subcommittee handling this bill—and most of them are from the Northwest, or the extreme West—occasionally ought to pass the folks back East just a little bone to chew on, you know, to keep us quiet. That is why I am disturbed, because in the final analysis, my State has to pay 8 or 10 percent of the taxes and some consideration should be given to the forests in the eastern part of the United States. So, I sit back when these legislative proposals are before us and say, "What do we get out of it?" If there is a \$472 million civil functions bill, we get \$1.9 million for Pennsylvania and we are taxed \$45 million or \$50 million. So I am getting to a point where I am a bit irritated as I see these boys from out West, from California and the Rocky Mountain States, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana—why they just sit down and they carve up the pie to suit themselves. They do just about what they like, and when somebody from the East or from a great State like mine comes in and says "Now, boys, why not be nice? Just give us a small bit as we have a great forest back East as well as the West—we would like to have just a few forest roads and trails; we would like to take out the over-mature timber;" why it is thumbs down. That is the story. You can take it and digest it any way you want to. This is an example of the splendid support and cooperation given me by my Republican colleagues.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on this amendment do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. YOUNG].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 54, noes 60.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For an additional amount for "Administration of Territories," \$47,000.

Mr. D'EWARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to ask the chairman of the Subcommittee for the Department of the Interior for an interpretation on the application of the highway-road program, section 6,

which says in part that the funds allocated shall be immediately available for contract. Further on in the same section it says that—

The Secretary of the Department charged with the administration of such funds is hereby granted authority to incur obligations, approve projects, and enter into contracts under such authorizations and his action in doing so shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government.

My question is, Does that apply to Park Service roads, Indian roads, carried in the Department of the Interior appropriation bill, as well as funds authorized under the Highway Act? I yield to the gentleman for an answer to the question.

Mr. JENSEN. That is right; it does.

Mr. D'EWARD. Is it applicable to park access roads as well as roads inside the parks?

Mr. JENSEN. It is.

Mr. D'EWARD. In other words, the funds appropriated in this measure and in the Department of Interior appropriation bill, which are about half of those that have been authorized, will be available for contract immediately, and they can contract the rest of the authorization, which will be met by a future appropriation?

Mr. JENSEN. That is right. Under the act which Congress passed early in the session for roads and trails in the Park Service, and in the Indian Service, and in the Forest Service—

Mr. D'EWARD. And approach roads?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes; that bill authorized the respective agencies to which it applied not only to contract for the road-building program, but also to pay for such contracts, because of the fact that that act in effect was not only an authorizing act but it was an appropriation act. It gave the agencies the power to spend the money; and, as we say, to write the checks to pay the bill. It is under the same kind of law as the Rural Electrification Administration. For instance, when the Congress votes to give the REA a certain amount of loaning power, the REA then goes out and allocates it to the different REA cooperatives, and they not only make the loan but they pay the bill. So the gentleman is exactly right, and the answer to all his questions is "Yes."

Mr. D'EWARD. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Chairman, I note that the supplemental appropriation bill includes funds for the construction of roads in the national parks which added to the amounts already appropriated will cover all of the authorizations for national park roads through the current fiscal year. If I am not correct in my interpretation, I trust that a member of the subcommittee will give me the proper information.

I am concerned today with the future program of national-park roads, and particularly with the action of the Senate and House conference committees on the use of Federal national-park funds on access roads not within park boundaries. Members will recall that the House committee report on the regular appropriation bill forbade the use of any of these funds on roads outside the parks.

The Senate committee struck out this restriction. The committees in conference agree to leave out the restriction but with the provision that the Secretary of the Interior make efforts to arrange other maintenance of the roads and report next spring.

We have in Montana two examples of park approach roads outside the boundaries of the national parks which may be affected by this committee action. One of them is the famous Cooke City entrance to Yellowstone National Park. The other is the so-called Blackfeet Highway which runs along the eastern boundary of Glacier National Park, outside the park, but is the only means of access to the many beautiful attractions in eastern Glacier Park. It is also the highway that connects Glacier Park with the parks to the north in Canada.

This road runs primarily through the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, and therefore might be eligible for Indian highway funds. However, it is doubtful that the Indian Service is primarily interested in the road.

It is not a part of the regular Federal-aid system, and I do not see how the State of Montana can afford to devote much money to it.

Therefore, it remains for the Park Service, to whom the road is primarily of value, to maintain and reconstruct this road, if anyone is going to do it.

I note that the new Federal-aid highway act provides that the Secretary of the Interior may contract for the full amount of the \$12,500,000 authorization for park roads for the fiscal years covered by the new act. Inasmuch as the present law authorizes the expenditure of funds for approach roads, I think it is clear that the restriction attempted to be imposed by the Appropriations Committee does not in any way affect the right of the Secretary to contract and obligate these funds for the Blackfeet Highway and the Red Lodge-Cooke City road, or any other approach road covered by the act of June 31, 1931, as amended.

Mr. Chairman, I include in my remarks a letter:

GLACIER PARK TRANSPORT CO.,
EAST GLACIER PARK, MONT.,
July 17, 1954.

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART.
HON. LEE METCALF.
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY.
HON. MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD.

GENTLEMEN: I am sure you are all aware of the danger that confronts the Blackfeet Highway which is the road which runs north and south in the Blackfeet Reservation along the eastern boundary of Glacier National Park and gives access to all the Glacier Park entrances from the east side. In other words, if there were no Blackfeet Highway there would be no way for visitors to enter or leave Glacier Park except by West Glacier (Belton).

The menace to the future of Glacier National Park lies in what appears to be a policy on the part of the Department of the Interior and/or the Congress not to assume the future maintenance of approach roads to national parks. This policy, if effective, would throw the maintenance of the Blackfeet Highway and the Redlodge Highway back on the State of Montana.

I enclose a copy of a letter dated July 13, 1954, to Mr. Horace M. Albright, president of the United States Potash Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y. Mr. Albright, as you all know, was Assistant Director of the National Park Service from its beginning in 1916 and succeeded Director Mather in 1930. I am writing him because he, as Assistant Director of the Park Service, was probably more responsible than any other person for the establishment of the policy of Federal maintenance of the approach road to Glacier National Park, which we know as the Blackfeet Highway. I call your special attention to this letter because I think it is important for all of us to know about this past policy and to make a vigorous effort to maintain it.

I do not know exactly how this present agitation developed. I have heard a rumor that the policy of refusal of future maintenance of approach roads to national parks originated in the Office of the Secretary of the Interior, but the wording of the conference report, as quoted in my letter to Mr. Albright, seems to indicate that both Houses are serving notice that Federal maintenance will be refused after this fiscal year.

I do not see how a State as small in population as Montana can afford to maintain the Blackfeet Highway, which is used primarily in the summertime by the inhabitants of the other 47 States. Then, too, our future strategy must always comprehend the fact that this Blackfeet Highway runs over Federal land in the Blackfeet Reservation.

I have been studying national park problems, first in Yellowstone and later in Glacier, for 47 years. The Western States which contain most of the national parks were outmaneuvered 20 years ago during the Ickes regime, when the Park Service took over the direction of the expenditure of millions of dollars for parkways in the Southeast such as the Blue Ridge Parkway and the Natchez Trace. Beginning at that time the amount of money annually appropriated for these Southeast parkways was about the same amount as the amount appropriated for the western national parks. I presume that this was brought about because Senators from the Southeastern States were in command of most of the committees. At any rate, the Natchez Trace, which memorializes Andy Jackson's route from Nashville to New Orleans, and the Blue Ridge Parkway have no more national significance than the route of Lewis and Clark, but there is no hope that the Federal Government will ever build a road across the Northwest to commemorate the matchless expedition of Lewis and Clark.

I predict that it is going to take a lot of effort on the part of all citizens of Montana and their Representatives to maintain the historic status of the relationship between the Federal Government and Glacier Park on the Blackfeet Highway.

The aim of this letter is to call to your attention the concern which those of us who are connected with Glacier National Park view the future. This road for many years has been in very poor condition and the maintenance today is of a low order on account of the lack of funds. Indeed, it is not too much to say that the Blackfeet Highway today is the poorest road in the State of Montana. The Great Falls Tribune and other papers have carried critical comments about this road as reported by 1954 visitors.

Yours truly,

HOWARD H. HAYS.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER VII

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Commission on Intergovernmental Relations Salaries and Expenses

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," \$414,000: *Provided*, That said appropriation shall be available for the hire of passenger motor vehicles and shall remain available until March 1, 1955: *Provided, further*, That the limitation under this head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1954, on the amount available for expenses of travel, is increased to "\$222,000."

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the first item under the heading of "Independent offices" concerns the salaries and expenses of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. With some other Members of this body, I have the honor to be a member of that Commission. The subcommittee on appropriations in this bill cut down the requests which were approved by the Bureau of the Budget from \$460,000 to \$414,000.

At this time the House members of that Commission are not going to ask for a restoration of that \$46,000. We will try to get along. However, I think it is only due to the House to let the Members know that this Commission is actively at work. We have been meeting constantly and consistently month by month from the beginning of the naming of the Commission. And we are making very excellent progress.

I have here in this envelope a preliminary report on the principles of the Federal-State relationship in this country, which will be the basis of our report. We have a schedule of operations set up which will, we believe, result in the finishing of our work within the allotted time, that is, by March 1, 1955.

May I say to the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Independent Offices that if by the 1st of January we find that these funds are not sufficient because of the deletion of the \$46,000, we shall be back before the subcommittee asking for sufficient funds to complete our work.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I want to associate myself with the statement the gentleman from Iowa has just made. As a member of this Commission, I feel I can state that all the Members of the House who are participating in the work of this Commission highly applaud the activities and program of the Commission to date and the ultimate results this Commission will achieve in serving the principles of intergovernmental relations. I would ask that we be permitted at this point in the RECORD to insert a joint statement which will detail the principles and the work of the Commission up to this time.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas, a member of the Commission.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I have asked the gentleman to yield only to subscribe to what he has said about the importance of the Commission's work. I hope we can complete our studies on the amount that has been allocated. I agree that there would be no point at this stage in asking for a further amount.

I do not know when I have been as much impressed by the work of an advisory commission, and this is more than an advisory commission, as I have by the work of this Commission. I had some reservations about its importance and its potentialities when I went on the Commission, but I am convinced that it is rendering a great service. I hope the material the gentleman from Iowa will insert in the RECORD will be read by the Members, because it is our hope that we will bring to the House a report that will have value, that it will not be a political document. I think if the Members could see the way the Commission goes about its work they would be convinced that there will be some constructive ideas that will mean a saving of money to the Federal Treasury and an improvement in the efficiency of both the State and Federal governments.

This is due partly to the fact that the Commission is representative of both Federal and State Governments and of both political parties. It will be recalled that the minority was assured substantial representation by an amendment to the resolution setting up the Commission offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] and concurred in by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. The chairman of the Commission, Mr. Kestnbaum, is doing a remarkable job and it is a delight to work with him and other members in exploring the complexities of our Government. I am confident that we will be able to supply some ideas for a better functioning and appreciation of local, State, and National Governments. I am sure the gentleman from Iowa shares that feeling.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments made by my colleagues, the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Arkansas, both of whom are members of the Commission. I appreciate their comments. At this point in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a joint statement as to the progress of the Commission up to this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, as part of my remarks, I include this joint statement on the part of Mr. OSTERTAG, Mr. GOODWIN, Mr. BROOKS HAYS, and myself:

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations was established by Public Law 109, enacted by the 83d Congress on June 27, 1953, and signed by President Eisenhower on July 10, 1953.

This legislation was the culmination of many years of effort on the part of many Members of the Congress to provide for a reexamination of the philosophy, the basic structure, and the operation of the American

Federal system. Concern had been expressed in many quarters even before the Second World War about the need for reinvigoration of American federalism. After the close of the war, bills were introduced in every Congress by Members of both major parties providing for the establishment of a commission charged with the task of studying the Federal system and recommending concrete measures designed to strengthen it.

The first such bill appears to have been Senate Joint Resolution 90, 1st session, 80th Congress, sponsored by Senator Herbert R. O'Connor, of Maryland. Similar proposals were made in each subsequent Congress by several Members, including Senator ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON, of New Jersey, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and Representative HAROLD C. OSTERTAG, of New York, all of whom were appointed to membership on the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations at the time of its establishment.

The first Hoover Commission authorized a study of Federal-State relations of a general nature and received a report on the subject prepared by the Council of State Governments. This Commission, however, recognized the need for a more intensive study of the current problems of federalism and made relatively few recommendations for alterations in our Federal system. Perhaps its major recommendation was one calling for "a continuing agency on Federal-State relations to be created with primary responsibility for study, information, and guidance in the field of Federal-State relations."

The establishment of the present Commission was requested of the Congress by President Eisenhower in a special message on March 30, 1953. Observing that "the present division of activities by the Federal and State Governments, including their local subdivisions, is the product of more than a century and a half of piecemeal and often haphazard growth," the President emphasized the fact that a study of American federalism was urgently needed. The legislation which became Public Law 109 was introduced in the Senate by Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, and in the House by Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana.

THE SCOPE OF THE COMMISSION'S WORK

In essence, Public Law 109 charged the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations with the tasks of making recommendations about a division of labor between Government at the national level and government at State and local levels, and about methods of financing the activities appropriate to these various levels. The preamble of the law, defining the general field of study given to the Commission, reads as follows:

"Because any existing confusion and wasteful duplication of functions and administration pose a threat to the objectives of programs of the Federal Government shared in by the States, including their political subdivisions, because the activity of the Federal Government has been extended into many fields which, under our constitutional system, may be the primary interest and obligation of the several States and the subdivisions thereof, and because of the resulting complexity to intergovernmental relations, it is necessary to study the proper role of the Federal Government in relation to the States and their political subdivisions, with respect to such fields, to the end that these relations may be clearly defined and the functions concerned may be allocated to their proper jurisdiction. It is further necessary that intergovernmental fiscal relations be so adjusted that each level of government discharges the functions which belong within its jurisdiction in a sound and effective manner."

The Congress charged the Commission particularly with responsibility for an examination of the present system of Federal aid to States and their subdivisions. The Commission must evaluate the existing system of

Federal aid and consider alternatives to it which might foster a more vigorous federalism than does the Federal system.

THE COMPOSITION OF THE COMMISSION

The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations is composed of 25 members—5 Members of the Senate appointed by the Vice President, 5 Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker, and 15 public members appointed by the President.

The present membership of the Commission is as follows:

Chairman, Meyer Kestnbaum, president, Hart, Schaffner & Marx Co.

Vice chairman, Hon. Alfred E. Driscoll, former Governor of New Jersey.

Hon. Alice K. Leopold, secretary of the Commission and Director of Women's Bureau, Department of Labor.

Hon. Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. John E. Burton, vice president, Cornell University.

Mr. Lawrence A. Appley, president, American Management Association.

Dr. William Anderson, professor of political science, University of Minnesota.

Hon. Sam H. Jones, former governor of Louisiana.

Hon. Charles Henderson, former mayor of Youngstown, Ohio.

Hon. Clark Kerr, chancellor, University of California.

Hon. Marion B. Folsom, Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Gov. Allan Shivers, of Texas.

Gov. Dan Thornton, of Colorado.

Hon. John S. Battle, former governor of Virginia.

Hon. Val Peterson, Federal Civil Defense Administrator.

Senator Robert C. Hendrickson, Republican, New Jersey.

Senator Andrew F. Schoeppel, Republican, Kansas.

Senator Guy Cordon, Republican, Oregon.

Senator Hubert M. Humphrey, Democrat, Minnesota.

Senator Alton Lennon, Democrat, North Carolina.

Representative Angier L. Goodwin, Republican, Massachusetts.

Representative James I. Dolliver, Republican, Iowa.

Representative Harold C. Ostertag, Republican, New York.

Representative John D. Dingell, Democrat, Michigan.

Representative Brooks Hays, Democrat, Arkansas.

The Commission is assisted by an executive director. Until recently this position has been filled by Mr. Dudley A. White, but it is now vacant.

The Commission's Research Division is headed by Dr. George C. S. Benson, president of Claremont Men's College, Claremont, Calif.

DURATION OF THE COMMISSION'S STUDY

The statute establishing the Commission provided that its final report was to be submitted to the Congress and the President by March 1, 1954. Because of the enormity of the field of study, the 2d session of the 83d Congress recognized the impossibility of meeting this deadline and extended the life of the Commission to March 1, 1955. The Commission's final report is due no later than that date.

PROGRESS OF THE COMMISSION

The Commission has been meeting for 1 or 2 days each month since its initial meeting in September of 1953. The early meetings were devoted to the planning and the organization of the work to be undertaken. More recent sessions have been occupied chiefly with study and discussion of information relevant to the problems on which the Commission must make its recommendations.

tions. The Commission has not yet arrived at the stage of making decisions on issues or of formulating recommendations.

The Commission has adopted three major methods of securing the information required for objective judgments on the problems which it must consider: (1) The central research staff provides information gained by original research and channels to the Commission the information obtained from other groups, whose assistance has been enlisted in special studies made for the Commission. (2) The Commission has further established a number of advisory committees, comparable to the task forces of the Hoover Commission, from whom information and recommendations have been requested. Each one of these committees is engaged in a study of one functional area of Federal-State relations. (3) Finally, certain Government agencies and private research organizations have conducted special studies for the Commission under contract.

The following committees have been established to make reports to the Commission:

Federal Aid to Welfare: Chairman, Dr. Robert W. French, vice president, Tulane University, New Orleans, La.

Federal Payments in Lieu of Taxes and Shared Revenues: Chairman, Arthur E. B. Tanner, president, Waterbury Foundry, Waterbury, Conn.

Federal Responsibility in the Field of Education: Chairman, Dr. Adam S. Bennion, vice president, Utah Power & Light Co., and former chairman of the Utah Public School Survey Commission.

Federal Aid to Agriculture: Chairman, R. I. Nowell, vice president, Equitable Life Assurance Society, New York, N. Y.

Conservation and Natural Resources: Chairman, William S. Rosecrans, chairman, California Board of Forestry, and past president of the American Forestry Association.

Federal-State Participation in Natural Disaster Relief: Chairman, Alfred E. Driscoll, former Governor of New Jersey and president of Warner-Hudnut Corp.

Federal Aid to Public Health: Chairman, Dr. Franklin D. Murphy, chancellor of the University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans., and former dean of the School of Medicine, University of Kansas, and former vice president of the Association of American Medical Colleges.

Advisory Committee on Local Government: Chairman, Sam Jones, former Governor of Louisiana.

Federal aid to highways: Chairman, Clement D. Johnston, president, United States Chamber of Commerce, and former chairman, project for adequate roads.

Administration of unemployment compensation and employment offices: Chairman, Ernest F. Eberling, professor of economics, Vanderbilt University, chief of research, Tennessee department of employment security.

The Committee on Federal Aid to Highways has already submitted a report to the Commission, as has the Committee on Federal-State Participation in Natural Disaster Relief. A report is expected in the near future from the Committee on Federal Payments in Lieu of Taxes and Shared Revenues. Most of the other committees will report to the Commission no later than October 1, 1955.

Three committees have been constituted composed solely of members of the Commission. The Committee on Projects and Organization, under the chairmanship of Mrs. Alice K. Leopold, has had the responsibility for the concrete planning of the research work undertaken for the Commission. The Committee on Historical Development and Principles of the American Federal System has prepared a draft statement of the evolution of American federalism and has identified some abiding principles governing Federal-State relations that appear

in our history. Mr. Lawrence A. Appley is chairman of this committee. The committee on grants-in-aid is engaged in a study designed to formulate general principles governing the extension of financial assistance by the Federal Government to States and their subdivisions.

State impact studies: Because the existing system of Federal aid to States and their subdivisions can be properly assessed only after an investigation of its effects within the States themselves, the Commission engaged five private research organizations to make studies of the impact of the system on selected typical States. Such studies were conducted in Connecticut, Kansas, Michigan, Mississippi, South Carolina, Washington, and Wyoming.

Reports from these firms on their findings have all been received by the Commission and are being analyzed by the Commission and its staff.

Similar studies are being made on a voluntary basis by qualified groups in the States of California and New York.

The Commission has further solicited information and recommendations regarding some of the most difficult issues presented by the grants-in-aid system from State commissions on intergovernmental relations which exist in 21 States and from unofficial commissions established under private auspices in 23 States.

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT AND PRINCIPLES OF THE AMERICAN FEDERAL SYSTEM

A basic report presenting the philosophy of the American Federal system has been prepared for the Commission by its committee on principles and historical development of the American Federal system. This report is divided into three major sections:

1. The development of American federalism from the adoption of the Constitution to the present.

2. An analysis of the forces tending to centralization versus the forces making for decentralization at the present time.

3. A statement of the historic principles governing Federal-State relations which are appropriate to the present day.

This document has been submitted to 15 distinguished scholars and practicing attorneys—all specialists in constitutional history and constitutional law—for critical comment. After criticisms have been received from this panel of experts, the Commission is expected to take final action on this report.

Clearly, the identification of the historic principles of the American Federal System is a prerequisite to the Commission's work in determining the proper sphere of Federal activity and the proper sphere of State-local activity in the areas which the various levels of government occupy at the present time. The opinions so far received from the critics to whom the document on the principles and the historic development of our Federal system has been submitted indicate endorsement of the general tenor of the statement which the Commission has under consideration.

FUTURE PLANS

The bulk of the research activity required as a basis for the decisions which the Commission will have to make will be completed during the month of October. The last 3 months of this year will be devoted to consideration of the information which has been assembled for the consideration of the Commission. During this period the Commission will reach its decisions on the major questions of policy on which it must pass. The first 2 months of 1955 will be given to the preparation, criticism, and revision of the Commission's final report.

CONCLUSION

No more important task has been undertaken by any of the study commissions which have been established for the guidance

of the Congress in recent years than that assigned to the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. The subject matter with which this Commission deals is concerned with the very fundamentals of our Federal system of representative self-government. The recommendations which it will make will bear upon the maintenance of the very structure of the historic American system of government. The Commission is performing its duty with keen awareness of the grave responsibility which it bears. It confidently hopes to submit to Congress and the President a report which will point the way toward revitalization of federalism in the United States.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, to assure the gentlemen who have spoken and all others interested, that I know, speaking for all of the subcommittee, there is no opposition and no antagonism whatever on the part of the subcommittee to either of these Commissions. I will take them both together and save the committee's time. The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, familiarly known as the Hoover Commission, and the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, formerly known as the Manion Commission and now known as the Kestnbaum Commission. I want to say for my part, and speaking for all of the subcommittee, that Mr. Kestnbaum made an outstanding and very real impression upon our committee. We just thought, and I say this in a semi-serious way, that you appointed us to consider the actual amount of money needed by an agency. It appeared that there were certain areas of duplication. It appeared that time elements were involved; that is, the amount of money that could be spent within a certain time. I think this particular agency, the Committee on Intergovernmental Operations, is doing an excellent job. So we in the subcommittee simply took 10 percent off of each of those 2 Commissions. I personally believe they will get along all right with the money appropriated. If they do not, the gentleman from Massachusetts has suggested a way to amend the situation.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Very willingly.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I certainly appreciate the comments that have been made by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices, and I appreciate his offer of cooperation with our committee.

Mr. PHILLIPS. We would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that we would like to get a few more people down here like the present chairman of the Committee on Intergovernmental Relations.

The Clerk read as follows:

For expenses necessary for alteration of Federal buildings to provide facilities for additional Federal judges as authorized by the act of February 10, 1954 (68 Stat. 8), and additional court personnel, and for expansion of existing court facilities, including costs of moving agencies thereby displaced from space in Federal buildings, \$3 million, to remain available until June 30, 1956.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CEDERBERG: On page 12, line 21, after "1956", insert *Provided*, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for providing facilities at Flint, Mich."

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, this is a limitation upon the appropriation bill rather than legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan is definitely a limitation. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, this is probably one of the few notes for economy to be struck here this afternoon. The reason I offer this amendment is that it is known that the request for additional courtroom facilities at Flint, Mich., in which to hold court in the eastern district of Michigan is entirely unnecessary. At the present time the court is held in Detroit, Mich., and in Bay City, Mich. We have adequate facilities there without the expenditure of \$179,400 more to put an additional court at Flint. Flint is located 45 miles from Bay City and approximately 60 miles from Detroit. In Bay City we have complete facilities for a Federal court, and I can say that the courtroom in Bay City is probably not used over 50 percent of the time. There is no excuse for not requiring the courts to be held where they are at the present time. Therefore, I definitely believe that the limitation should be placed in here. And I might say that my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CLARDY], who represents the city of Flint in the Congress, is entirely in agreement with it.

I shall take up no further time of the Committee.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think I may say, Mr. Chairman, no member of the subcommittee on this side is opposed to economy. We are glad to accept the suggestion of the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there is an idea quite generally believed that Congressmen are always in favor of economy provided that it does not affect their district. Well, today I hope to prove that this is not always true. I have not presented a single measure to this Congress seeking a single dollar of appropriation for my district. I have not voted to increase any of the appropriation measures, and I have voted consistently to reduce them. I am just as much opposed to the unnecessary expenditure of money in my own district as I am at any other point in the Nation, or abroad.

When the basic legislation was before us seeking the addition of many more judges, I tried to make the point that we were saddling the taxpayers with a

great deal more expense than some people seemed to think. Now the chickens are beginning to come home to roost. We are asked to spend a tremendous sum to provide each judge with a new courtroom and all that goes with it. But out in my district we are really going hog wild.

We have created the new judges. Now we propose to spend nearly \$200,000 at one place to construct suitable quarters. In so doing they plan to oust a number of people already on the payroll and place them in rented quarters elsewhere in the city of Flint. How much added yearly cost this will bring I do not think anyone can estimate. And, of course, this endless chain will bring yet other and additional expenses as the story unfolds.

When the original measure was before us, I was the only member of the Michigan delegation who stood out in opposition to the whole idea—trying vainly to point out that we were saddling the taxpayers with a permanent additional cost that meant well up into the millions every year. Well, that bill was passed and now we are stuck. But I cannot see any need in going completely crazy in trying to carry out and finish off the mistake we have already made. Why on earth we have to build new courtrooms at new places just because we have new judges is beyond me. Does anyone suppose that all of the litigants to be served by these new courtrooms will come from the city where those courtrooms are located? Anyone who has ever practiced law knows that that simply is not the case. But even if we are going to build new courtrooms, for heaven's sake, let us be as economical and tightfisted as we can. It would be infinitely cheaper to try to rent space, but if we must build let us draw a tighter rein.

When the original legislation was before us I vainly tried to point out that the House was making yet other mistakes in my own district. This bill does not provide any money for courtrooms in Mason, the county seat of my home county, yet it is one of the places where court is supposed to be held. Do you know why no money is provided in this bill? Well, strange as it may seem, it is because the bureaucratic planners made a sad mistake. They actually succeeded in picking a point where there is no Federal building they could alter or change to make over into a courtroom—and so they are stymied. When I made that point when the original measure was before us I was laughed out of court. Now they have to admit I was correct. But that is not all. Mason is a lovely, but rather small county seat. It cannot possibly furnish hotel accommodations for lawyers and litigants. I tried to make the point that the State capital, Lansing, should have been selected. There it would probably have been possible to rent quarters in existing or in some of the new buildings the State and the city are erecting.

Over in the district of my good friend, PAUL SHAFER, the bureaucrats are stymied once more. We have named Kalamazoo, but they cannot find a building

to remodel into a courtroom—and so this bill makes no provision for funds for that purpose. I have no way of knowing, but I am willing to wager that the same extravagance and probably the same mistakes will be found repeatedly throughout this program. The whole idea ought to be junked and given an entire going over at the next session.

A few days ago I listened to Members plead for a huge addition for airport construction. Last year we thought we had nailed down the lid on that program. Now we have opened Pandora's box—we have set the stage for ever-increasing demands for more and bigger handouts. We heard Member after Member ask us to vote for that additional money because there was an airport in their district that needed attention. Only Uncle Sam can do anything about it apparently. I came away from that session with a decided impression that many of us believe that we will not return to the House if we do not bring home the bacon in the way of projects for our own district. But you know I have the crazy idea that voters and taxpayers are the same people. And I have the further idea that they are a great deal more interested in our protecting their pocketbook than they are in voting concrete monuments to forever publish to the world how successful we have been in getting something out of the public Treasury for our own district. I may be wrong, but I think the folks back home are a lot smarter than we sometimes give them credit for being. I hope the amendments I am supporting will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to address certain questions to the chairman of the subcommittee with reference to this appropriation. On page 771, part 2 of the hearings appears the request for funds needed to provide certain facilities for the Federal courts at Miami, Fla. A breakdown of how those funds are to be expended appears on page 773 and 774 in exhibits.

I feel sure that the committee is well aware of the critical need for further Federal court facilities in Miami, the extremely heavy and congested docket in the southern district of Florida, and the fact that with the confirmation of our new Federal judge, Emmett Choate, which has been recommended by the Judiciary Committee of the other body, the already critical space situation there will be further aggravated. In reducing the total appropriation request of \$4,800,000 to \$3 million, was it the intention of the committee to disapprove any of the additional courtroom facilities requested for Florida on page 771 of the hearings?

Mr. PHILLIPS. May I explain the situation. This came to us in a supplemental bill as an amount of money needed to make alterations, remodeling, provide air conditioning, furniture and equipment, to pay the expenses of moving and to pay the costs of design and supervision and to allow for contingencies.

cies. We did not go into the individual desirability of these things. We thought that had been settled. We simply took the list, looked it over and said that on the basis of the costs of doing these things already known to the Federal Government, the estimates were high. Certainly an estimate of more than a quarter of a million dollars for contingencies that were unknown, the cost of alterations and repairs higher than we usually pay, and particularly, Mr. Chairman, the furniture and equipment, in which we said rather lightly perhaps in our report we thought justice could be dispensed just as well from a chair costing \$100 as from one costing \$275. The cost of furnishing these judges' chambers and courts are away beyond anything for Cabinet officers, for Senators, or for Congressmen. We thought the amount of money we took off did not result in any reduction, in elimination or any specific reduction. I might mention to the gentleman that certainly a Member from Florida and a Member from southern California will join in saying we would hardly want to reduce air conditioning.

Mr. LANTAFF. That rumor was prevalent, may I say to the gentleman from California, that the subcommittee was frowning on air conditioning in these courtrooms. I am pleased to hear the chairman say that no funds were eliminated for that purpose.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The only time we frown upon air conditioning is when Congress stays in session past July 31, then we begin to hope that the air conditioning will go wrong.

Mr. LANTAFF. Then am I correct in saying that the funds for air conditioning the courtrooms in Miami have been provided in this bill?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. LANTAFF. The reductions were based on what was determined to be an excessive cost per foot for construction, excessive moving costs and items of that type rather than to reduce the facilities requested?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman is correct with respect to furniture and such details.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLARDY: Page 12, line 12, strike out "\$3 million" and insert: "\$2,820,600."

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, all I need to say on the amendment is that you have adopted the major amendment which eliminated Flint. If you do not adopt this amendment you may just as well not have adopted the other one because you will have left in the bill the money that the bureaucrats will spend somewhere else. Therefore I ask that the committee agree to this amendment so that the total amount will be reduced accordingly to prevent them from spending it where the Congressman from the district agrees it should not be spent on the basis of \$200,000 for 1 courtroom for 1 judge.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LANTAFF. Is the figure that the gentleman has used in his amendment based on the total amount requested for the facilities at Flint?

Mr. CLARDY. It is the exact amount.

Mr. LANTAFF. In view of the statement just made by the gentleman from California that in making this reduction the committee did not eliminate funds for any particular facility but reduced it on a square footage basis for all, would not the total amount of the gentleman's cut have the effect of affecting all of the other courtroom facilities provided for in this bill?

Mr. CLARDY. As I said, there are seven courtrooms for which the language is used that they do not know where they are going to put them. They are undetermined as to where they are going to locate them. I do not think we are far wrong if we cut off a few thousand dollars. If the gentleman can tell me how much has actually been cut off I will be glad to accept an amendment to my amendment that will revise it.

Mr. LANTAFF. I think the subcommittee could possibly best state that figure in those areas where they were not ready to have facilities. The committee took that into consideration in making the reduction.

Mr. CLARDY. There is nothing to indicate they have taken out the entire amount at the other seven places. I hope they have.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CLARDY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLARDY: On page 12, strike out lines 14 through 21, inclusive.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, now I am giving you the works. What I am proposing by this amendment is to strike out every red cent that you are appropriating for new courtrooms in order that there may be a more careful study and more time given to what you are doing. Do you realize that out of the 30 new courtrooms you are providing, that if this document is correct, there are 7 of them in which it is said, "Location undetermined."

May I point out that the total amount that it comes to for those seven is some \$383,400 before the committee made any reduction. I do not know what they did, but that, to a country lawyer, is a whale of a lot of money. It seems to me when you are spending somewhere between \$125,000 and \$150,000 to provide 1 courtroom for 1 judge in the various offices throughout the country, we ought to stop, look, and listen. This costs money, and you are going to not only spend this amount as the capital amount, but you are going to add additional employees. Out in Flint, for instance—and I did not mention this before, because I did not have the time—do you know what they are trying to do? And they are doing it all over the country. They are going to throw people out

of the post office in order to have rooms remodeled, which means that those people are going to have outside offices leased and furnished at Government expense from now on until perpetuity, as long as the Republic exists. I do not know how many hundred million dollars a year this is going to cost us, but unless we start out making some small savings—probably the way we are spending billions of dollars—this \$300,000 is chicken feed. But to me it is a lot of money, and it seems to me we would be wise to put this off at least until the next session, until we have time to know where, for example, they are going to locate the 2 out in California, 1 down in Louisiana, I do not know—I will probably step on somebody's toes, which may defeat the passage of the amendment, but here is North Dakota, South Dakota, Texas, and West Virginia. Just imagine—in all of those places they managed to figure out that they are going to require \$146,500 to remodel buildings that they do not even know where they are going to locate or find. Then there is air conditioning, \$54,500, for buildings that they do not know anything about; \$87,450 for furniture; \$18,300 to move something—I do not know what—and for other things which come under the general heading of design they have got \$102,500, and the contingencies amount to something like \$71,000, contingencies for places they do not know anything about. It seems to me it is time we struck the entire item out, and I ask that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, as far as this side is concerned, we are glad to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan. Apparently it is designed to bring about a much-needed retrenchment in several strategic sections of the country. We cannot go far wrong in maintaining the status quo in the locations indicated.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The situation is this: The Congress of the United States has already decided that there shall be certain of these new judges and certain places provided for them to sit. The job of the Committee on Appropriations was to provide the money. That we have done. I do not see offhand how we can go back on the action of the Congress by adopting an amendment, to deny all the money, offered on the floor without previous consideration.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The opportunity does not often present itself for me to speak on any matter that is of particular interest back in my district, but it just so happens that Indiana has gotten along with two judges, for 4 million people, for years and years. We were assigned 2 new judges, under an arrangement providing for a session of court to be held in Lafayette, Ind.

A post office building was built there some years ago with appropriate rooms for a court. There are certain other expenses incident to the establishment of

that court that will have to be met. I cannot quite understand the reason for undertaking to strike from this bill all of the funds that would be needed to meet the situation which, as the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] has said, we have created by the legislation we enacted establishing these courts, and which are to be staffed by judges and the other necessary personnel.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. BELCHER. If we are going to hire a judge, are we not going to have to provide him a courtroom in which to hold court?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I was about to make that statement in closing, that having provided for these judges, we must buy them something to sit on.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CLARDY. Would the gentleman have any objection to an amendment that would make it necessary for judges to sit where courtrooms already exist, eliminating only those where you are going to provide new courtrooms at tremendous expense, which will call later for expansion?

Mr. PHILLIPS. May I correct the gentleman? I have a good deal of sympathy for his position on this matter. May I say that the amounts of money which the gentleman named for such things as air conditioning and other purposes are not the amounts which appear in this bill. Those are the amounts that were submitted to the subcommittee, but when the subcommittee got through, they were reduced.

Mr. CLARDY. I stated that I did not know how much the committee had reduced them, but I feel, figuring on the same basis, that there would still be over \$300,000 which could be eliminated.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CLARDY].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For necessary expenses to carry out the purposes of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1861-1875), as they pertain to the United States program for the International Geophysical Year, \$1,500,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES: On page 13, line 22, strike out the figure "\$1,500,000" and insert "\$2,500,000."

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered to correct the illogical conclusion attained by my usually logical and very able associates on the Appropriations Committee, who cut this appropriation by 40 percent.

This appropriation for the International Geophysical Year is to finance the United States share of a thrilling scientific experiment in which scientists from more than 30 nations have joined in a worldwide study of the physical properties of the world—its crust, its interior, its oceans, and its atmosphere. This experiment will involve every major land and sea mass. Its measurements will extend from extreme ocean depths to a height of more than 100 miles above the surface of the earth. It is an experiment that cannot be deferred since it is set to take place at a time during a period of sun-spot maximum—and I submit that this is a factor quite beyond the control of the Appropriations Committee and of Congress.

This magnificent venture is important for many reasons. It is particularly appropriate at this very troubled time when international tensions are mounting. This endeavor is marked by no tensions, but rather by a spirit of friendship. It is constructive. It completely avoids power politics. The best scientific minds of 30 countries are generously offering their talents for the benefit of all mankind. Mutual undertakings such as this one truly promote better understanding between nations and establish bonds for peace. The International Geophysical Year will help the world go round, in more ways than one.

Secondly, the scientific data gathered by this conquest of many of the mysteries which surround man's life on this planet will extend to remote regions never before invaded and will be of infinite value to man's progress. Members of this House are necessarily travelers. They are called upon frequently to fly to and from their districts. This experiment will make the voyages not only of Members of the Congress, but of all air travelers more comfortable and safer by furnishing data to improve communications between planes and stations along the ground, as well as giving more precise information about conditions through the skies in which planes must fly.

Is it important to the people whom you represent to know when drought or rain or flood, or snow, or freezing ice will occur? Is it of interest to the people of your district to be warned more quickly of the possibility of their being caught up in the destructive whirl of tornadoes or the roaring, ripping frenzy of hurricanes? Of course it is. This study will offer better information on the causes of such natural phenomena and the possibility of dealing with them and dissipating their destructiveness. Is it important to those of us who live in cities to know the causes of choking smog and harmful air pollution? It certainly is. This investigation will furnish knowledge valuable to the eradication of such conditions.

This program is tremendous in scope. Surveying and measuring stations will be established all over the world, in tropical and temperate climates, and in polar regions. The weather that we enjoy in Washington or Chicago or Los Angeles or Miami Beach has its origin many thousands of miles away in a set of complex events related to the sun's activity

and to conditions in the oceans. Today we operate without adequate knowledge of these conditions and how they build up or evaporate as they move toward us. A sudden storm this year, unpredicted because basic knowledge was inadequate and did not permit exact forecasting, had as one of its consequences the destruction of aircraft valued at \$10 million, aircraft which could have been flown away had the storm prediction been possible. In recent atomic tests in the Marshall Islands, Japanese ships were showered with radioactive atomic particles as a result of unknown atmospheric winds which carried the particles to unexpected regions. The horrors of the hydrogen bomb are as nothing compared with those of its big brother, the cobalt bomb, explosion of which has never been attempted because it is feared that its destructive searing radioactive particles will be caught in high atmospheric gales and transported around the world.

The nature and structure of the earth profoundly affects the growth and development of each nation and intimately influences the relation of one nation with another. Regions which today are fertile and fruitful are undergoing transformations that may make them sterile and uninhabitable. Areas now populated and heavily industrialized may in the future disappear beneath the oceans if the present warming up of the polar regions long continues. Let me invite the attention of the Members from Florida to the importance of this experiment by quoting Dr. Gould's testimony which appears on page 925 of the hearings:

We know since 1900 that the climate or weather of the polar region has been warming up at an unprecedented rate. If it goes on at the present rate, in 25 or 50 years we will be using the Arctic Ocean for navigation. I do not believe the Antarctic icecap will melt enough to worry you and me; but if all the ice started to melt at some time in the future, it would submerge Florida.

While this experiment serves the cause of international peace, it also serves our national defense. A few weeks ago the Christian Science Monitor carried the story of the Soviet rocket threat, and I quote the first three paragraphs:

One day, perhaps within a very few years, it is possible that a new star may appear in American skies as a spectacular announcement that Soviet engineers have begun the practical conquest of space.

Right now they are working hard on a superrocket that will have the power of 10 battleships and that may eventually be used to establish a spaceship that would hang in the sky and circle the earth like a second moon. If such a ship ever does appear as an unexpected and brilliant object in the night sky it will be a grim indication that Soviet engineers may have developed the know-how to drop atomic missiles on any point of the earth they choose.

According to George P. Sutton, supervisor of the aerophysics department of North American Aviation, Inc., this is more than just a possibility. It is an announced goal of Soviet military scientists toward which they are working with the intensity with which they tackled the hydrogen bomb.

If the attack by Soviet rockets occurs it will have to come through the regions above the stratosphere in the ionosphere

which is to be part of the study. The formulation of a defense to this type of attack must inevitably depend upon knowledge of the upper regions. Our approval of this undertaking is imperative.

As a matter of fact, when I listened to the expert witnesses who testified before our subcommittee, the greatest geophysicists in our country, I could not escape the feeling that they were pioneers for interplanetary travel. They have already sent radar beams to the moon and back. Dr. Berkner told us that he hoped shortly to be able to send beams to the sun and back.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to compliment the gentleman on studying and bringing this subject before us in this way for two reasons: First, this matter of abstract research which seems so far away turns out to be the very foundation of the anti-Communist struggle, as we are finding out today; and second and very importantly, we have to develop, and develop far better than we are doing, the resources of our earth if we are to keep pace with our own problems. I think a Member who studies a subject as abstract as this in an effort to bring it to our attention in the way the gentleman is doing is entitled to the gratitude of all of us.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

The cost of the entire worldwide survey is anticipated to be \$100 million of which the amount contributed by the United States would be \$13 million and that contributed by the other nations \$87 million. The appropriation in this supplemental bill is the first installment. The appropriation request of the National Science Foundation was \$2½ million. The sum approved by my subcommittee was \$1,500,000. The amendment I have offered is to restore the cut made by the Appropriations Committee, because the committee's cut seems to me to be illfounded, both in reason and in logic. This is no giveaway program. This is a joint venture and offers us the opportunity to exercise world leadership for human progress. Why should we hesitate to participate wholeheartedly in a program admittedly beneficent which serves all mankind? Why at the very beginning, should we show reluctance to cooperate with other participating nations by cutting the funds necessary and agreed upon for our participation? Should we not rather show enthusiasm and encourage other nations to join wholeheartedly in the effort?

Particularly does this cut not make sense because this is only the first installment on the total cost to be borne by the United States. On any basis of analysis and reasoning, it is obvious that \$2½ million will have to be spent. The testimony before our committee shows that of this sum only \$32,000 is for personal services and the balance is for the purchase and construction of necessary instruments and machinery, much of which will require at least 2 years to obtain. An appropriations cut at this

time will be especially harmful because it will delay procurement by 6 months. We shall not again be called upon to consider a further appropriation for this purpose until the regular meeting of our Appropriations Subcommittee next spring, a delay which will throw the whole program out of kilter. If the total sum requested is ultimately found to be excessive, would it not be more logical and proper to make the reduction after the program is underway and there is a better appreciation of its actual cost?

No, Mr. Chairman, this cut at this critical time does not make sense. I urge that my amendment be adopted.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The situation is as follows, as I am informed:

There is the appropriation of \$12,250,000, of which \$8,400,000 is for support of basic research. Three million dollars of this amount was earmarked by Congress for support of basic research formerly supported by the Department of Defense. One and three-tenths million dollars of the \$8.4 million available was obligated by the National Science Board for research grants approved at its May meeting.

The Foundation had on hand on July 1 of this year more meritorious research proposals than it could support with the entire \$8.4 million available. In addition, the Foundation expects to receive during the balance of the year at least \$30 million more in meritorious new research proposals. Therefore, it seems perfectly obvious that we would be cutting back the program very severely by following the committee's recommendation. There appears in the hearings the following letter from President Eisenhower, which bears definitely on the point before us, and should be weighed carefully by all who are interested in supporting his program.

The letter is as follows:

DEAR DR. BARNARD: I appreciate your letter with respect to the United States program for participation in the international geophysical year.

I am glad to support this undertaking. It is a striking example of the opportunities which exist for cooperative action among the peoples of the world. As I understand it, some 30 nations will unite their scientific resources for a simultaneous effort, extending over 2 years, to penetrate the basic geophysical forces which govern the natural environments in which we live. Under especially favorable conditions, scientists of many nations will work together in extending man's knowledge of the universe. The findings of this research will be widely disseminated throughout the world, aiding in the further development of telecommunications, aviation, navigation, and weather forecasting. It is doubtful whether any single nation could undertake such a program. Acting in concert, each participating nation, contributing within its means, secures the benefits of the program.

The United States has become strong through its diligence in expanding the frontiers of scientific knowledge. Our technology is built upon a solid foundation of basic scientific inquiry, which must be continuously enriched if we are to make further progress. The international geophysical year is a unique opportunity to advance science, while at the same time it holds the promise of

greater technological gains both for ourselves and for other nations.

I am sure that our participation in this far-reaching effort will very materially strengthen our bonds with the many cooperating nations and make a constructive contribution toward the solution of mutual problems.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

I do hope we will take into consideration the actual facts confronting the foundation fiscally and also take into consideration this very important message from the President of the United States.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman for the statement he has just made. He and I have discussed this matter personally. I believe most of the members of my committee, which handles the authorizing legislation for this foundation, feel rather strongly that this is a legitimate request and that it is an important one. I hope the committee will adopt the amendment.

Mr. HESELTON. I should add this to something Dr. Waterman had to say to the subcommittee:

The geophysical year is entirely separate and distinct from the regular programs of the National Science Foundation.

It has been established by the President under a separate appropriation title.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I do not want to disturb the gentleman or take up his time, but I do want to point out that interesting as his discussion is regarding the geophysical year and interesting as it is to me personally, my subcommittee is not in the least opposed to the geophysical year.

Mr. HESELTON. If I have left any impression to that effect, of course, I do not mean to do that. I compliment the subcommittee upon their recognition of the importance of this.

Mr. PHILLIPS. We think it is a good idea—the whole argument before us is where is the money going to come from, which question I will discuss on my own time.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mr. YATES. Does not the gentleman believe that it is incongruous to approve a request for an appropriation of \$2½ million, and then to allow only \$1½ million in supplemental funds, and then tell the National Science Foundation that if it wants this international geophysical year, to strike out the money on the approvals already given to basic research and use \$1 million of those funds for the geophysical year?

Mr. HESELTON. I most certainly do. It is a rescission retroactively. The President recommended \$14 million. The other body approved \$14 million, but the House only approved \$11 million. The final result was \$12,250,000. Consequently, the Foundation will be in serious difficulties if we do not adopt this amendment.

As has been stated purchases of machinery and equipment must be made. A good deal must be done in preparation. This is not part of the Foundation's regular, important program. Little enough is being done in the vital field of basic research. Those who recognize the soundness of President Eisenhower's strong recommendation will certainly support this amendment.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, unless the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] wishes time to speak, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 5 minutes.

Mr. PRIEST. I do not care to prolong the debate further and I will be content if the gentleman will yield to me to make just one statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. With further reference to what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] just said, I feel very strongly that the subcommittee is fully conversant with the situation which has developed here. I believe they are in sympathy with the objective. It does seem to me it places the National Science Foundation in a rather unfavorable position when they are required, if they go through with this program, to take from their regular program commitments which have already been made. I hope the distinguished chairman of that particular subcommittee will take that fully into consideration in whatever he may have to say to the House. I thank the gentleman for having yielded to me at this time.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I assure the gentleman that the commitments have not already been made. We were careful to inquire on that subject before we put out this supplemental, and having inquired, and having found that the commitments had not been made, we then suggested that the NSF do not make them until they read the supplemental bill.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Is it not also true that the National Science Foundation, out of regular funds, has been preliminarily supporting this project for 2 years plus?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is also correct.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I will yield later.

Mr. Chairman, let us see what the situation is regarding this. There is no argument in my committee regarding the geophysical year. We think it is all right, we think the NSF ought to spend the \$2½ million that my friend from Illinois thinks it ought to spend, but we do not see the need for haste, and we are positive that it can come out of the money for the National Science Foundation, which has authority and supervision over this. They have been getting a little more money each year regularly, I would say a good increase in the appropriation for the work they

do. Whether they are doing it well or not is not under debate; most of us think they are doing it all right.

Last year the National Science Foundation had \$8 million. We gave them an additional \$3 million to take care of work which was to be transferred to them. Then in the other body, \$1,250,000 was added to that, on what I will say was a minimum of justification. So when this came up we said to the NSF on the basis of their own testimony that part of the work in the geophysical year—which was to work out a program of benefit to the same young scientists that come under the National Science Foundation—we said we would cut it a million and then take a million out of their fund. I have a letter in front of me addressed to the Senate committee by the Director of the National Science Foundation, in which he does not like the idea at all, but in which he says they will use the million dollars for that.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for half a minute for one observation?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I think this is really a tempest in a teapot.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes, it is.

Mr. THOMAS. There is no one on the floor, certainly no one on our subcommittee, who is against this work. It ought to be done. By the same token there is not a man on this floor nor is there anybody in the National Science Foundation who knows within 25 percent of what it is going to cost.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman is right.

Mr. THOMAS. There are 18 nations, perhaps, who will participate in it, and, of course, pay their fair share when they know what that is.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. THOMAS. This is not going to be started until 1957.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. THOMAS. It is going to last 1, 2, or maybe 3 years. When they get far enough to know what it is going to cost then the subcommittee is going to give them the money. They cannot possibly use this money now. They do not know what it is going to cost.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. YATES. In reply to what the distinguished and able gentleman from Texas has said, there is no doubt in anybody's mind but what this machinery has to be purchased and paid for.

Mr. THOMAS. What machinery, and what are you going to pay for?

Mr. YATES. You are going to pay for it on the basis of the justifications. They came to our committee and showed need for \$2½ million of this machinery to be purchased at this time.

Mr. PHILLIPS. When I was in high school I learned about the theory of checks and balances provided by the Constitution of the United States. Since coming to Congress I have learned something too about checks and bal-

ances, because we try to balance the budget and the other body is very liberal with the checks. This is going over to the other body where it will be considered. Why not let nature take its course?

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. May I just quote from a letter dated July 18, signed by Mr. Alan T. Waterman, Director of the National Science Foundation? He states:

The foundation carried over on July 1, 1954, more research proposals of high caliber than it will be able to support during the entire 1955 fiscal year. We will assuredly receive more research proposals this year than last.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. YATES) there were—ayes 36, noes 59.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation is hereby authorized to make such expenditures within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to it and in accord with law, including not to exceed \$250,000 for administrative expenses, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided in section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out its authorized functions for the fiscal year 1955: *Provided*, That said funds shall be available for the acquisition of not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles from excesses reported by other agencies, or from forfeitures; for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed \$100 per day; and the administrator is authorized, subject to the procedures prescribed by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, to place not more than 4 positions in grade 16, 17, or 18 of the General Schedule established by said act, and such positions shall be in addition to the number authorized by said section.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we got down a squirrel hole a little while back on the matter of the Veterans' Administration. I have no desire to take a lot of time on the subject but I want to straighten out some things, particularly for the benefit of my friends in the areas where they have had letters regarding veterans' hospitals.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, we are not following the direct limitations or budget recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget and we have not been for 2 years. We are taking the number of beds determined by the Veterans' Administration itself. We tied that to the amount of money which the VA needs for those beds at their own figure. If anybody questions the amount of money in the regular bill, they have only to turn to page 804 of the hearings on the

supplemental bill now before you and you will see there a letter from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration giving the amount of money needed. As I said before, the number of beds occupied was raised above the authorized average. So in this supplemental bill we have given them an additional amount.

I want to say that just appropriating money for a hospital does not open beds, as you well know, Mr. Chairman. You have to have nurses, doctors, technicians and psychiatrists. Time and time again you have been given information about beds being closed in hospitals which were not closed at all.

When we talk about the Brockton Hospital, let us be fair. Let us say it was poor judgment on the part of the Veterans' Administration. But no beds were closed. The VA simply decided in these few months not to open additional beds. I think that was poor judgment. But remember that the cost per bed per day for the Brockton Hospital was \$34 a day and that the average cost for that type of hospital ought to be about \$13 or \$14 at the most and has been lower than that.

All I can say is that Congress has been trying very hard to tie these figures down. We are trying to give the managers of the hospitals more authority. In the case of the hospital in St. Louis, that is a brand new hospital and is developing its bed capacity.

This is a general medical and surgical hospital, and what we need beds for is NP's and not for general medical and surgical. So, I do not want the statement made on the floor that this House had cut an appropriation; that we took a figure from the Bureau of the Budget and said that is it. We did not do that last year nor this year. And, I want you to understand, if you turn to part III of the hearings on the appropriation bill, first you will turn to page 2970 when the representatives of the American Legion were heard, they said, in part:

We are very much pleased with the action of this committee and the results of what you provided for what is termed "hospital inpatient care for the current fiscal year."

A very interesting statement appears from the young AMVETS:

AMVETS are aware of the tremendous problems facing the Independent Offices Subcommittee as it considers VA appropriations. . . . We have consistently attempted to indicate to the American public our belief that any program not good for the country as a whole cannot ultimately be of benefit to veterans. . . . We pledge to you our continuing support in arriving at this cherished goal.

I think we are working out of what has been a difficult problem in the past and I feel our friends who are concerned on the floor today need have no further concern.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I agree with what the gentleman has stated about our committee asking the Veterans' Administration as to the amount of funds needed for medical care and that we gave them

that amount of money. I stated I thought the Bureau of the Budget was a stumbling block in that procedure, and I cited to the gentleman the testimony on page 836 of the hearings wherein Mr. Brundage, who appeared before our subcommittee, stated that it proposed to see that the operation was carried on on a minimum basis. I asked him what he meant by "minimum basis," and I thought he said that usual standards were not to be carried out on the same basis as they had been in the past.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

For construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, and facilities for the Navy, as authorized by the act of June 16, 1948 (62 Stat. 459), the act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155, 82d Cong.), the act of July 14, 1952 (Public Law 534, 82d Cong.), and the act of —, 1954 (Public Law —, H. R. 9242, 83d Cong.); including not to exceed \$2,500,000 for advance planning as authorized by section 504 of said act of September 28, 1951; furniture for public quarters; personnel in the Bureau of Yards and Docks and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation; and engineering and architectural services as authorized by section 3 of the act of April 25, 1939 (34 U. S. C. 556); \$73,517,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RIVERS: Page 17, line 4, strike out the figure "\$73,517,000" and insert the figure "\$140,000,000."

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment raises the Navy appropriation for military public works from \$73,517,000 to \$140 million, which is the amount which the President has asked that the Congress appropriate, as well as the Bureau of the Budget and the Comptroller of the Department of Defense. Our Committee on Armed Services held hearings on the projects contained in this bill and enumerated in the report accompanying this bill. We approved a certain figure, and it went before the Committee on Appropriations, and they likewise approved the projects but directed the Navy to build them from money which it was alleged now existed in the Department of the Navy, that is, \$300 million. I got in touch with the Navy Department and they claim they do not have \$300 million from which these projects may be constructed. I got in touch with the Chief of Logistics of the Navy and asked him whether or not the money was available. He said the money was not available and they did not have \$300 million that these projects could be constructed with.

Here is the important thing. Two out of three of these items which were given the blessing of the Committee on Appropriations would have to be eliminated if the \$73 million figure in the bill were retained.

But I did not stop there. I talked with 2 or 3 members of the Committee on Appropriations. I talked with one in particular, and he said, "If you want to find out what the figure is, contact the Comptroller of the Department of Defense." I contacted the Comptroller of the Department of Defense and asked him to give me the figures on this. Also I found out that at that very time they were appearing before the Senate committee on this proposition. I asked them what their position was going to be and they said they had a statement that they were giving to the Senate committee. I have a copy of that statement here and I should like to read it to the Committee:

The Navy currently has an unobligated balance of \$300 million. About \$166 million is committed for planned construction; another \$80 million is reserved for construction temporarily deferred because of lack of base rights, land acquisition, design criteria, necessity for additional engineering data and similar difficulties. The balance is being held to cover anticipated contingent costs, Bureau administrative expenses and technical collateral.

Technical collateral, I may add, covers many things which are highly technical but which are very vital to the program of construction.

It can be seen that roughly \$130 to \$140 million of the current unobligated balance is tied up in normal operations so that only a portion of the unobligated balance is available for new work.

In order to carry out a balanced program throughout the year unobligated funds must be available for commitment during the last months of the fiscal year in order that obligations may be promptly incurred in the beginning of a new fiscal year. It is considered that approximately \$200 million in unobligated funds represents the minimum requirement of all the above factors—

That is the safety factor—

to operate an orderly and effective public works program.

Anticipated obligations of \$240 million in fiscal year 1955, together with the \$140 million in new funds requested, will result in an estimated unobligated balance of \$200 million at the end of fiscal year 1955. An unobligated balance less than this amount would disrupt the orderly planning and progress of essential work. For this reason an appropriation of \$140 million—

This is the Secretary of Defense speaking; this is the Comptroller of the Department of Defense—

an appropriation of \$140 million for fiscal year 1955 is required.

Based on the fiscal year 1955 public works authorization bill passed by the Congress, the Navy funding program is now \$220,044,000. Even with the appropriation of the \$140 million recommended by the President and use of \$67,307,000 from savings and deferral of previously funded projects, the Department of the Navy will have to defer construction of urgent projects in the fiscal year 1955 public works program in the amount of \$14,353,000. A reduction of \$140 million to \$73,517,000 will necessitate deferral of additional projects in the program in the amount of \$64,867,000. Deferral of only \$3,010,000 of the latter amount can be accepted without seriously impairing the Navy's ability to execute its worldwide mission adequately. The balance of \$61,857,000 represents the estimated cost of urgent projects in the program. Deferral of these will reduce the operational effectiveness of the

Navy, will hinder the Navy's exercising economical management and preclude the provision of proper personnel housing.

Department of the Navy public works program, both annual and long range, are kept under continuous study. The program submitted to the Congress this year was, from its inception, based on only urgent and essential projects and has been trimmed of every questionable item by repeated critical review in the Department of Defense and Bureau of the Budget. A study by the Department of the Navy of the effects of the House Appropriations Committee action on this program indicates that it will be necessary to defer the construction of urgent and essential projects. It is emphasized that the urgency of these projects is such that delaying their funding until fiscal year 1956, or even later, involves more risk than should be accepted.

That is the statement that they made before the Senate Appropriations Committee.

The Armed Services Committee of the House screens these projects to the best of our capacity. The Appropriations Subcommittee of the House gave them their blessing. I know about the discrepancy in the testimony, may I say to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin, and the rest of the members of his committee, but I have gone to the fountainhead wherever I could find it to get the information. I went to the Navy, and I went to the head of the budget in the Defense Department, and he said that the President's program is a bare minimum and that the risk of a further cut should not be assumed.

This is my position. I know some projects in my own district. I know about them. They tell me that 2 out of 3 of these projects would be cut. One of them is moving a marine jet base away from Miami. We have got to have it. They tell me that project may not be attempted. I impute nothing to the subcommittee, but the President says he needs this \$140 million, the Department of Defense says they need it, and the Navy claims they need it. If we curtail the operation of our Navy, Army, and Air Force, how on earth can we fulfill our mission? The President says he needs this. He is our Commander in Chief. His subordinates say we need it. Our committee believes we need it. I urge the committee to consider this problem and restore this appropriation to the minimum asked for by the President.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment affects one section—the naval section—of a general program for construction in Army, Navy, and Air Force.

I am in complete accord with what the gentleman says about the importance of this item and the need for this construction. We are at a critical stage in international affairs and it behooves us to take every precaution to prepare for unexpected emergencies.

But, the committee has taken all this into consideration and has more than amply provided for such needs in all three of the services.

For example, we have provided in the bill \$484 million new money for Air Force construction. They had on hand at the beginning of the fiscal year an unobligated balance amounting to \$1.2 billion.

This supplementary \$484 million provides an aggregate of \$1,684,080,000 for naval construction for the fiscal year of 1955.

Prospective obligations for the fiscal year amount to \$1,250,000,000, leaving, out of an abundance of caution, \$434,000,000 to be carried over into the next fiscal year, 1956.

In Army funds we have at the close of the fiscal year, June 30, 1954, an unobligated balance of \$640 million. Our estimated obligations for the current fiscal year, 1955, amount to \$250 million. In other words, we provide by reappropriation in this bill \$390 million in excess of all estimated obligations for the fiscal year 1955.

Coming now to the provision for Navy construction, there remain unobligated funds of \$300 million from last year, which with the \$73,517,000 new money carried in the pending bill, provide a total of \$373,517,000 against estimated 1955 obligations—an excess of \$83,517,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1954.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. The Navy has made it plain and I have tried to make it plain, Mr. Chairman, in my statement, that the Navy claims they have obligations and commitments which will dissipate this alleged surplus. I went to the comptroller of the Department of Defense, and he told me that he does not have the funds which the committee claims that he has. Does the gentleman question the comptroller of the Department of Defense? May I add that the State Department prohibits the Navy from entering into any base agreement with a foreign power until the money is paid on the barrel head. That is the policy. Consider the Spanish bases. There is another item.

Mr. CANNON. I am much interested in the statement quoted by the gentleman from South Carolina. I am aware of his deep interest in the subject and his long familiarity with the service and am anxious to cooperate with him.

The committee held exhaustive hearings on this item. We had before us the official representatives of the departments including the budget officer. All data was carefully studied and screened and the bill is based on that information.

Here is a tabulated summary predicated on the testimony adduced by the committee:

Air Force:	
Unobligated, June 30, 1954	\$1,200,000,000
New funds, fiscal year 1955	484,080,000
Total	1,684,080,000
Estimated obligations, fiscal year 1955	1,250,000,000
Navy:	
Unobligated, June 30, 1954	300,000,000
New funds, fiscal year 1955	73,517,000
Total	373,517,000
Estimated obligations, fiscal year 1955	240,000,000
Army:	
Unobligated, June 30, 1954	640,000,000
Estimated obligations, fiscal year 1955	250,000,000

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CANNON was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the accuracy and dependability of this summary is further buttressed by the fact—and it is a rather remarkable fact—that for the last 3 years, successively, they have failed to expend, by many millions of dollars, the funds allocated to them for this purpose.

It is sometime a question as to whether it is a greater error to appropriate too little or too much. Certainly, in this instance we have not recommended too little. The bill provides ample funds for Air Force, Army, and Navy construction and the amendment proposes the addition of money which in the opinion of the committee is not needed and cannot be used.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can reach an agreement as to time on this particular amendment. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes, 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, I would like 5 minutes. Does the gentleman from Maryland desire time?

Mr. DEVEREUX. Yes.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Why not make it 20 minutes?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I modify my request and ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 20 minutes, 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, if the gentleman will couple with that that the time be divided equally I will go along with him. The time has been divided pretty evenly thus far today.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws his request.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the thing that is in issue here is not what the Navy is going to be able to build, not what the Navy is going to be able to obligate for construction during this 1955 fiscal year at all. The only thing that is at issue here is how much they are going to have left in the way of unobligated balances at the end of the 1955 fiscal year. That is one of the things that has bothered this subcommittee ever since we have had the responsibility of handling the military-construction program. It goes back to the 82d Congress, when the gentleman from South Carolina was the chairman of this subcommittee. He was plagued with that problem then, and it has continued since.

We have made a concerted effort to bring about an orderly functioning of the military-construction program. I might say that one of the things that has concerned us the most has been the lag that has occurred between the time the money has been appropriated and the time when it has been realized in terms of actual construction. We are

beginning to make great progress along that line because we are beginning to set aside funds for advance planning so they can do a much better job, telling us what they are going to do, where they are going to put it, and what it is going to cost. As I say, we are making a good deal of progress in this direction.

One of the things we are attempting to do is to bring down this huge backlog of unobligated and unused money that has been carried over from year to year. The same problem that the gentleman from South Carolina has attempted to bring before you with respect to the Navy applies to all of the other branches of the service and we have been working in the same manner with respect to all of them.

Great reliance has been placed upon a statement that was read here which came from the Comptroller of the Department of Defense. If the Comptroller is endeavoring to be helpful to this subcommittee and to be helpful to the Assistant Secretary of Defense in Charge of Property and Installations, who has been of great assistance to us in our work, it seems to me that he has shown a rather strange way of doing it when the only objection that comes to this subcommittee comes by way of a gentleman who is not on the Appropriations Committee and in a letter that is read on the floor of the House, of which no member of the subcommittee had any prior notice. Is that the way we are going to determine the financing of an important program?—and it is an important program.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. I did not depend on the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY], I did not depend on the letter from the Navy Department. I went to the Comptroller and this letter has been presented, this statement has been presented to the other body with a request urging an increase in these appropriations. Does the gentleman question the Comptroller of the Defense Department?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I do not question him personally. I do question his judgment and in not bringing this information to the attention of members of the subcommittee some time before. The information that was furnished to us came from the budget officer of the Department of the Navy, Admiral Clegg. He is the man who testified before our subcommittee, he is the man who gave us the figures that the Navy had \$300 million in unobligated funds at the beginning of this fiscal year. We had his testimony, we had the testimony of the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, that the Navy could not obligate over \$240 million during this coming fiscal year. Therefore there will be \$60 million unobligated in the hands of the Navy for military construction at the end of fiscal year 1955 without the addition of one single dollar carried in this bill.

The question then is, Do you want to leave \$200 million in the hands of the Navy for military construction to be

carried over in 1956 fiscal year or do you want to leave \$133 million which this committee considers to be ample, to be a reasonable amount? It was on that basis upon which our committee took its action.

The Navy, as the gentleman from South Carolina said, had requested approval to come before us to ask for an amount of \$140 million in new money. They got subsequent permission from the Director of the Budget to present an overall program of \$221 million. There was an admission at the beginning that they had a substantial amount of money at hand that they could use for the 1955 program. After full consideration by members of the subcommittee, and we gave it full consideration, the decision was reached that they could easily get along, with the right kind of a program that the gentleman from South Carolina and I and our colleagues on this subcommittee have been trying to develop for the last 3 years. It is on that basis that the action of this subcommittee was taken.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish very much that I could feel convinced that the picture just presented by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] is an accurate picture. If I could feel convinced of that, I would not be in the well here now. But I am considerably in doubt for a number of reasons as to whether the issue really is an issue as to how much unexpended or unobligated funds the Navy will have at the end of the current fiscal year. I, too, am interested in an orderly program and in the elimination of the timelag in construction insofar as that can be accomplished. I have made some little study of the military construction, particularly of the Navy construction program, and there is a timelag in a great many cases that ought to be corrected. But I am not at all sure that approaching it in this manner will accomplish that job.

For instance, let us take the situation which has been referred to with respect to overseas construction. It is pointed out that in a great many instances we have not even acquired base rights in order to obligate funds for that overseas construction, and that is correct. Unfortunately, negotiations are still in progress with respect to those and the funds have to be set aside under a mandate from the State Department, so I am informed, so that if the agreement is worked out with respect to those bases, the funds will be there for the construction. Now, that is the information which I have. If that is the case, then those funds are not available for other construction.

I am concerned because I am familiar with a number of these projects that are listed in the report, some of which I am given to understand cannot be constructed if the limitation which has been imposed by the committee prevails. I certainly do not want to insist that there be any additional funds appropriated beyond the amount which can be properly and efficiently expended, but I do not want to see the Navy hamstrung and not be able to build the essential facilities. Obviously there is some misinformation

and misunderstanding in this matter. It seems likely that the committee's reduction might prove to be a mistake. In such a situation I think it safer to run the risk of erring on the high side. If we appropriate the increased amount, and it should prove to be unnecessary it would not be spent and no harm would be done. Certainly, with all of the screening of the requests and final approval by the Bureau of the Budget, we cannot be far wrong if we appropriate \$140 million to take care of items which aggregate \$196 million.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me to cut that down to \$73 million is going mighty far, and I am just afraid that we are going to jeopardize our program and put the Navy in a bad spot unless we approve the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that President Eisenhower—whether we agree that he is going to make a great President or not, we all agree he is a great military man—recommended in the supplemental budget \$140 million for public works for the Navy and \$945,997,000 for acquisition and construction of real property in the Department of the Air Force. The committee treated his recommendations brutally. They murdered his recommendations. Let us be frank about that. They did not cut it 5 percent or 10 percent; they cut his recommendations nearly 50 percent. So far as the President's recommendation in connection with national defense is concerned in this bill, they simply murdered them, and that was done by a committee controlled by his own party.

Now, what do they do under the Department of the Air Force? They reduce his recommendation of \$945,997,000 to \$484,080,000, a cut of \$461,917,000. In other words, out of a \$1,100,000,000 recommendation in the budget, they cut \$528,400,000.

My friend from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] talks about not getting information. I always had the idea that the recommendation of the President, contained in his budget, was worthy of profound consideration. Apparently President Eisenhower's recommendation—and this concerns our national defense—did not get very much consideration. I am very much concerned with world conditions, exceedingly concerned with world conditions. I am exceedingly concerned with the tremendous power advance that has been made during the past 3 years by the Soviet armed forces.

I have before me certain information, much of which has been carried in the newspapers here and there, but not all of it, which I think my colleague should be acquainted with and which the American public should be advised of. This is a current appraisal of Soviet strength.

From 1947 to the present time, the numerical strength, 175 divisions, of Soviet

ground forces has remained fairly constant. Nonetheless, significant changes have been made in favor of increased mechanization with sturdy and efficient modern equipment. Sixty-five divisions of the present establishment are tank and mechanized divisions. Moreover, rifle divisions have been provided motorized equipment; they also now have organic tanks and additional artillery. Thus, the mobility and fire power of all Soviet divisions has been increased through introduction of improved weapons and equipment.

The U. S. S. R., Eastern Germany and East European satellites today have over 6 million men under arms. Approximately 4½ million of these are in ground forces. A high state of preparedness is maintained by a rigorous training program.

The number of satellite divisions has almost doubled since 1947, bringing their total to about 80 divisions.

And this does not include Red China.

The U. S. S. R. has a readymade spearhead for a rapid advance into Western Europe. This spearhead is composed of 22 Soviet divisions in Eastern Germany. The bulk of these are armored divisions with nearly a complete complement of tanks and self-propelled guns. Behind this spearhead there are an additional 60 Soviet divisions located in the Eastern European satellite countries and Western U. S. S. R. This does not take into account satellite divisions.

Their mobilization system is exercised periodically to insure its effectiveness, and by M plus 30, Soviet and satellite ground forces could number 400 divisions.

The numerical strength of Soviet Air Forces in recent years has been constant—having been stabilized at about 20,000 aircraft—but the rapid increase in Soviet air potential is illustrated by the rate of change-over to jet aircraft. In 1951, about 20 percent of their fighters were jet types. By early 1954, almost all their fighters were jet types.

A similar development has occurred with respect to their light bombers. In early 1951, jet light bombers had not been introduced into operational units. By 1954 well over two-thirds of their light bomber forces were jets.

In the medium-bomber category, Soviets have doubled, since 1951, the number of TU-4's (similar to United States B-29) in operational units.

Still newer types of medium and heavy bombers, including jet models also, have been observed.

The development of a comprehensive aviation training program has been one of the most significant contributions in Soviet post-war program to improve capability Soviet airpower.

The program for airfield construction—

And that is what concerns us in these matters.

The program for airfield construction is still in progress with attention recently being directed to fields with very long runways. In the past 3 years, Soviets have about tripled the number of major airfields in Eastern Europe which will accommodate jet fighters.

In the past, the combat value of satellite air forces has not been significant. In 1951, their aircraft were obsolete. By 1954 the numerical strength of satellite air forces had been doubled, with nearly half being jet fighters. Their facilities were improved, and training had reached a fairly satisfactory standard.

The growing complex of airfields throughout Eastern Europe, the aircraft control and warning systems and anti-aircraft artillery dispositions of Soviet bloc are rapidly becoming capable of providing an effective air defense belt along the western perimeter of the U. S. S. R.

Since the end of World War II, the Soviet Armed Forces have improved their potential for use of airborne troops and weapons.

The principal naval threat is the Soviet submarine capability. The Soviet Navy has over 300 submarines in service, of which about half are large or medium oceangoing types. Current large-scale naval construction program lays emphasis on continued production of large oceangoing submarines.

Soviet sea mine stockpiles, considered together with a considerable air and naval mine laying capability, constitute a growing threat, particularly against the line of communications of the Allied Command, Europe.

Full credit must be given the Soviet bloc for having developed a strong capability in special fields of atomic, chemical, and biological warfare, as well as in the field of guided missiles. The Soviet economy has maintained a level of military production sufficient to provide equipment and supplies for Soviet and satellite forces and still pursue a program of stockpiling.

To illustrate the magnitude of their total equipment stockpile, the Soviets have more than enough tanks, mortars, and antitank guns for some 300-odd Soviet divisions. Their stockpile of field artillery and anti-aircraft artillery is several times that required to supply those divisions. The annual production of these items is continuing at a sizable rate.

These are the facts. That is what we are up against. There is the power, the growing power of the Soviet Army, Navy, and Air Force, in the past 3 years.

The only thing the Communists respect is what they fear, and the only thing they fear is military power greater than they possess themselves. In this bill we are cutting down by nearly 50 percent the recommendations made by a man who is a great military leader, who knows the military field, who has had as much knowledge and experience and who knows as well as any man can of military tactics. Yet this committee and this House are about to cut down by over \$500 million, nearly 50 percent, his recommendations.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion. The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 20 minutes, the last 10 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX].

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, apparently there seems to be an honest difference of opinion as to whether or not we have the money. I would suggest to the committee that in view of

that fact we should provide this money and then if it turns out that the money is not needed, it certainly will not be spent.

I would also like to point out to the committee, if I may, that we will have large amounts of military hardware rolling off the production line during this next year. It seems to me that we should make ample provision to properly take care of that military equipment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on the Armed Services I have tried to follow the needs of the Defense Department. I feel that that great committee has as much knowledge on this subject as has the Committee on Appropriations. I further believe that this legislative committee is the most competent committee of the House with respect to defense matters.

We recently had before us a military housing bill in which in the first instance it was proposed to take the money for them from unobligated funds. But a gentleman appeared before our committee from the Committee on Appropriations and made the plea that that committee knew there were unobligated funds accruing in that department, that certain rescissions had been made to leave a balance of unobligated funds available for the Defense Department. He stressed guns, tanks, and ammunition in case of an emergency. That this money was left there on purpose against an emergency. Many of us took the statement he made at face value and pressed for a new approach for funds for this new housing.

Certainly, I am a bit confused when a members of the Appropriations Committee tells us that the money in unobligated funds is earmarked for emergencies and they know of it. Then they come in and tell us that the full appropriation recommended by the Department be reduced and money in unobligated funds be used. It is inconsistent.

You and I know that any funds appropriated have to clear a dozen hurdles before being spent. If it is necessary to have that backlog as an emergency then the argument that the money should be now taken out of those unobligated funds falls flat on its face. The members of the Appropriations Committee should get together and reconcile their position.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I find myself at this moment perplexed. On the one hand we have the members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations assuring us that there are ample unappropriated funds with which the Department of the Navy can complete its public works program in accordance with budget estimates. On the other hand, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] comes up with a letter indicating that a necessary and urgent program of public works will be seriously curtailed unless we approve of his amendment to

restore funds eliminated by the Appropriations Committee.

I have the highest regard for the members of the subcommittee, and I know that in their hearings they have developed a certain understanding regarding unexpended funds. But on the basis of the very recent letter from a responsible officer of the Department of the Navy, I cannot find it in my heart to vote against the amendment.

As far as I know there are no construction items in this program in my legislative district. Like many members of the committee I am concerned only with one aspect—national defense. However, I have in mind that if we should err on the generous side the Nation would not be hurt. The money just will not be spent; and here may I say that my regard for the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Thomas, is such that I am firmly of the opinion that any unnecessary expenditures of the Navy will not be made.

So, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that I support the amendment for the reasons stated, and urge those members who are uncertain to do likewise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the figures presented by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS], relative to the Navy are the figures that were unanimously agreed upon by the entire subcommittee and were the figures presented to the full Committee on Appropriations and approved. The figures were arrived at based upon the testimony of the Department itself. Far be it from me, and I will say that equally for any other Member of the House, to do anything that would be in the direction of weakening the defenses of this country. But when the testimony is such as to be a justification of the position of a department that is itself a part of the defenses of this Nation, no other result could be reached by a committee that was seeking to do its duty as well to the Defense Department as to the Congress of the United States and the people of America. As to the unobligated balance of the Navy, the committee based its figures on the amounts that were presented, namely, \$300 million. The committee allowed new funds in the sum of \$73,517,000. That totals \$373,517,000. Now, the estimated obligations presented to the committee by the Department itself, after long hearings, are set forth in the sum of \$240 million. This leaves a balance after expenditures anticipated for this year of \$133,577,000. Now, I think in justice to the situation that figure should stand.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND] to close debate.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is a bit of difference of opinion among any of the Members who have spoken here today in support of this amendment and the members of the subcommittee. The whole question is a matter of a full understanding of the fund involved. As my distinguished friend has just said, nobody would cut down the adequate defense of this

country, either of the Navy or of the Army or of the Air Force, and this committee has not done so. There is not one project in this bill which this committee has been told was an urgent project which has been curtailed or impaired or hurt in any degree. We can make mistakes, of course, in this committee, but the whole question is whether you are going to accept the results of the information which we have accumulated in 4 solid weeks of hearings, both mornings and afternoons, or whether you are going to accept a sudden letter which comes from one of the officials of the Department of Defense. Reference was made to the effect that the source of this information came from the fountainhead. Well, I think the fountainhead of fiscal affairs still belongs to the House of Representatives.

I want to emphasize just for a moment the figures that my friend from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], has just given you, because they are important and, if listened to and understood, they are entirely dispositive of this whole controversy. The table, which comes from the Department of Defense and which I hold here and will leave on the table if any Member is concerned about it, shows an estimated unobligated—not unexpended but unobligated—balance at the end of June 30, 1954, or \$280 million, a figure which at the Navy's most optimistic rate of spending could not be spent during this fiscal year. As a matter of fact, however, there is a little later information than that contained in that table, and as the chairman of this subcommittee has told us, Admiral Cleton, the responsible fiscal officer of the Navy, in testifying before our committee on page 598 of the hearings, said this. Now, this is an official from the Navy, not from this committee.

It is estimated that obligations during fiscal year 1954 will amount to approximately \$180 million, resulting in a balance of \$300 million unobligated at the beginning of fiscal year 1955.

So the figures which the committee has indicate that unobligated balances as of June 30, 1954, are \$300 million. New funds allowed by the committee during this year which will take care of every project which the Navy has testified to as being urgent and necessary in our defense, \$73,517,000. That is new money, and that makes a total available to the Navy for this fiscal year of \$373,517,000.

Now, at the rate of estimated obligations, and this again is not from the committee but from the Navy, and is a most optimistic rate, they will obligate at the very best during fiscal 1955 the sum of \$240 million. That will leave a balance at the end of the next fiscal year in excess of \$133 million of unobligated funds.

On the other side there has been some talk about confidence in the Commander in Chief, or confidence in the Comptroller of the Department of Defense, or some other officer downtown. I suggest to my friends on my left that they also have confidence in the members of this subcommittee on the minority side; the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, the former chairman of the committee,

Mr. CANNON; Mr. RILEY, of South Carolina and Mr. RABAUT, of Michigan. This is not a report of a Republican subcommittee. This is a unanimous report of this subcommittee after 4 weeks of exhaustive hearings.

I suggest, with all respect to the Committee of the Whole, that we adopt the considered report of this committee in full confidence that the Navy will have ample funds to carry on all of its work in the fiscal year 1955.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to transfer whatever remaining time I had to my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I certainly shall not take all of the time remaining, which my colleague has so kindly yielded to me. I want to say this, as one member of this committee. I urge all the Members of the House not to get too excited, nor to let their blood pressure get too high about some communications that they may have had from downtown regarding the funds requested. As far as I am concerned, as one member of this subcommittee, if the amount allowed the Navy were cut to \$50 million rather than \$72 million, the Navy still would have more money than they can possibly use. I think this committee, if it has erred at all in suggesting appropriations, has erred on the side of the Department of the Navy and has given them ample money.

I just want to say this without quoting any more figures, that we have gone into this matter day after day after day, and if all of the experts can refute the figures that we have, I should like to see them do it. There is plenty of money here for the Navy, more than they can spend.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations and facilities for the Air Force as authorized by the act of January 6, 1951 (Public Law 910, 81st Cong.), the act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155, 82d Cong.), the act of July 14, 1952 (Public Law 534, 82d Cong.), the act of August 7, 1953 (Public Law 209, 83d Cong.), the act of April 1, 1954 (Public Law 325, 83d Cong.), and the act of ———, 1954 (Public Law ———, H. R. 9242, 83d Cong.), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; \$484,080,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to make an inquiry of the distinguished chairman of the committee in reference to the Air Reserve field contemplated for Akron, Ohio, in the vicinity of Cleveland. The testimony appears at page 254 of the hearings. I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman whether or not a site has been picked for this particular airport in Ohio.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The testimony we received, and to which my colleague on the Committee on Appropriations has called my attention, would indicate that at the time they testified, before our subcommittee at least, they had a pretty firm site. In fact, at page 255 of the hearings you will find my question of Colonel Rodenhauer, as follows:

Although negotiations have not commenced, you do definitely have in mind the 4,250 acres you want?

Colonel Rodenhauer's answer was: "Yes, sir."

So, at the time they testified, and acting upon that testimony, our committee did provide \$4 million to permit them to acquire land and make a substantial beginning on the necessary airfield pavements.

Mr. BOW. Are there in the committee files a statement covering a definite site, so that we might know definitely where the site is and where they contemplate building on this field of 4,250 acres?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. No, I cannot say that we do. As a matter of fact, the record shows they had not actually begun negotiations for any particular land at all, but they did have in mind the acreage that they wanted. Under those conditions you always run into the question as to whether they are going to be able to acquire the particular site they have in mind.

Mr. BOW. May I ask the gentleman this question: Do they come back to your committee prior to the actual acquisition of the site?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Under the existing law they are not required to come back to our subcommittee, but the law does require them to get the approval of the legislative committee, which would be the Armed Services Committee, for the acquisition of the land after they have formally made the decision to go ahead and acquire it.

Mr. BOW. So that it would come back to the House, but to another committee?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. To the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. BOW. Can the gentleman tell us how many planes are anticipated to use this 4,250-acre tract of land?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I cannot give the gentleman any estimate on it at this time. I do know it is a combined facility, to be used for both the Air Force and the Naval Reserve.

Mr. BOW. And I understood some of the National Guard.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think that is true, yes.

Mr. BOW. Did the Defense Department at any time to the gentleman's knowledge consider the use of existing airports such as the Akron-Canton Airport or other airports now in existence that might be made available to them for this purpose?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. They assured us they had done that. They also told us that they had had a considerable amount of difficulty in finding a place they considered to be suitable for this rather large metropolitan area that this is intended to be served.

Mr. BOW. There is nothing in the record to show the extent of the usage, the number of planes, or the flights? As I understand, it is a weekend training corps reserve.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. It is a large reserve installation for the Air Force and the Navy.

Mr. BOW. Can the gentleman tell us what the final cost of this field will be?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The present total estimated cost is \$13 million.

Mr. BOW. In reading the hearings, it seems that the \$13 million goes to the Air Reserve, without consideration as to what the cost will be for the naval installation or the National Guard, which obviously would increase it far above the \$13 million.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think the Navy would have some facilities of its own in addition to those that are indicated here, yes.

Mr. BOW. Can the gentleman give us some idea of what that may run?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. No, we have not had any testimony on that.

Mr. BOW. So as far as the Navy is concerned, their testimony is not here, or that of the National Guard.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take the floor at this time to address some questions to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Wisconsin, if I may. I call his attention to page 34 of the committee report, the third paragraph, below the list of items. I notice that the funds requested for the construction of a pipefitters' shop at the San Francisco Naval Shipyard has been stricken and the amount reduced by \$1 million. May I briefly lay a foundation for it. This pipefitters' shop at San Francisco Naval Shipyard was destroyed by fire in 1948. Since then they have been using a temporary building which is completely inadequate. I have been through the San Francisco Naval Shipyard many times and have seen the present pipe shop, and therefore am familiar with its inadequacy. They are using outside areas and pipe is being worked on in the outer areas, which is not a proper place to do that kind of work. It has been in the past 4 or 5 years the bottleneck in yard production, not because of the men but due wholly to the poor facilities. One of the reasons advanced by the Navy Department for the reluctance to put some of the new complete overhaul jobs on the larger carriers into San Francisco Naval Shipyard was because they could not do so until they got a decent pipefitters' shop. I simply cannot understand why the committee cut this amount in the face of this situation and the need for repairs on those vessels operating in the Pacific Fleet. Having said that, may I have an explanation of the situation from the chairman of the subcommittee?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I first of all want to point out that it was not the intention of the committee to permanently deny this facility and to strike it from the Navy's construction program. We recognize there is a need for expanding and rebuilding the present facility

for pipefitting work. The testimony showed that the present facility consisted of 30,000 square feet. We recognized that this is inadequate. The request, however, was for 60,000 square feet, and the unit cost of what they had in mind from such inquiries as we made appeared to be out of line. So we did with that pretty much what we have done with a number of other facilities, and that was to ask them to review this building, both as to size and unit cost, and present the request to us again when we meet after the first of January.

Mr. SHELLEY. May I ask the gentleman this question: If the action of the committee is accepted as an admonition by the naval authorities, and if they supply more adequate information by the time this is acted upon in the other body, will that information have some effect upon the minds of the committee here?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I wish to assure my good friend the gentleman from California that we try to keep an open mind on these problems and to give very careful consideration to all the requests presented to us.

Mr. SHELLEY. I assure the gentleman that that information will be made available by the time you go to conference.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin a question regarding the Air Force, which my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] whose district adjoins mine, discussed. Would it be possible to request the gentleman who testified before your committee previously to come back to the committee and tell you what site they now have in mind?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. It was just yesterday when my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, called the situation to my attention. It was the first time I had information that there was apparently some uncertainty as to just where this is to be. The justifications that were shown to us indicated it was 13 miles northwest of Akron. If there is a different factual situation than what was presented to our committee that is something which we would certainly want to make inquiries about of those who presented the original information to us.

Mr. AYRES. I have been informed by officers at the Pentagon that they now have no intention of placing this airport in Medina County where they previously stated to you the site of four-thousand-and-some-odd acres was located, which they had in mind. Before they are permitted to spend the \$4 million I understand they have to come back to the Armed Services Committee. But in order to clarify a very confusing situation in the northeastern part of Ohio I think it would be advisable to have them come back and state just what site they do have in mind.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I know the gentleman is very much concerned about this.

Mr. AYRES. Oh, I am concerned because I have one county to be concerned

about that I need if I am going to return here and I do not want to ruin that chance by an airport at this particular time.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. In view of this uncertainty, if the gentleman will send me a brief memorandum I will be very happy to inquire further into this matter and give him any information I may be able to find about it.

Mr. AYRES. One other question, if the gentleman will permit: Is it not customary when you have an established airport with millions of dollars of Federal money invested, to prefer its expansion to the creation of entirely new areas?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is the general policy where the expansion of existing facilities will provide what is needed to perform the mission. Sometimes that works out, sometimes it is better; but we have a number of instances where there is a great deal of community concern over the attempt to use existing airport facilities where it is close in; sometimes that does not work out. That is the general rule, but a general rule that is very frequently honored by exceptions to it.

Mr. AYRES. I would suggest to the gentleman that when the officers come back to his committee that he suggest to them that they spend a little more time than they have in the past exploring the possibility of expanding the Akron-Canton Airport rather than investing money in other sections of northeastern Ohio. If the gentleman has any idea when he could get this information I have a gentleman from Akron, a Mr. Fulton, who is quite familiar with the expansion of airports in the area and who is very much interested in the question.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. If the gentleman will include that in his memo I will have it looked into as well.

Mr. AYRES. I thank the gentleman and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time following my colleague from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] to discuss with the committee the same subject and what is referred to in their hearings as the Cleveland-Medina Airport. I call particular attention to the phraseology used in the hearings, because when I was first elected to Congress 2 years ago it was brought to my attention by members of Portage County and residents of the area and Aurora particularly that a reserve airport was planned in this area. I made particular inquiry both within the military and civil air establishments of our Government to determine the fact as to whether or not there were any such plans for such a base, and also inquired of the various congressional committees involved and

When the hearings on this bill were published and my colleagues and myself inquired into the matter, however, I was informed that not only was the area for this field not specifically selected, but that an area was also under consideration in Portage County, Ohio, which disturbs me greatly.

I do not wish to take the position here that we are opposing the airport or the field in Portage County. No community

wants to stand in the way of national defense, nor does any community without great consideration want to ask that \$13 million not be spent in the community. But may I also point out that the location in Portage County would jeopardize even more the situation which exists there. Already almost an eighth to a tenth of the farm land of Portage County and of the tax base of Portage County has been removed by the reservoirs of the city of Akron and additional reservoirs which are planned by the Federal flood-control project; by a large ordnance arsenal; by a large segment of the turnpike of the State of Ohio; by a Federal housing project that has recently been turned over to private hands; and by the Kent State University. This project which would involve some 4,300 acres would remove still more land from the tax base of the county. It would have a tremendous impact on the school and local tax picture. On the other hand, the field would mean the expenditure of at least \$11 million in the county and the creation of a payroll which would mean jobs and increased business to the county as a whole.

The Air Force has said that the Hopkins Airport in Cleveland cannot be used as a Reserve training airport of the scope contemplated. They have said that the location must be along a general radius of a line between Akron and Cleveland so that the field would be available to Reserves from Cleveland and Akron. It seems to me that a location can be found which will not destroy any established community. I cannot help pointing out that the site which has been discussed with me is one which involves the community of Aurora. It comes within less than a half mile of this beautiful little community, which is a very good residential community, where the property values are extremely high, and also the community of Mantua. Both of these communities would be almost put out of business as far as residential areas are concerned were such a base built.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. May I ask the gentleman to point out to the members of the committee that it will be at least next spring before a final decision can be made on this in view of the fact the Armed Services Committee would have to agree on a site.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. AYRES. In the meantime, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON], anyone else who is interested, and myself, can meet with the gentlemen of the committee, including the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS]. I know that each and every one of us will not stand in the way of progress; but we do want the experts to be honest in their decision and tell the committee where, in their judgment, the best airport can be had.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman. I have been assured by the Air Force that no selection of a site will be made without full discussion with the Congressmen involved. I have not

liked the seeming doubletalk and lack of openness which this whole subject of location has received to date. However, now that we know definitely that the national-defense needs require that an airfield be built in a general area, and this bill makes appropriations therefor, I feel sure that the Air Force will be glad to work with local authorities to secure a proper location. I intend to assist to this end, but I shall certainly oppose any move to locate this field where its planes will threaten destruction of the property or land values of long-established communities.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 802. Funds appropriated to the military departments for military public works in prior years are hereby made available for military public works authorized for each such department by the Act of — 1954 (Public Law —, H. R. 9242, 83d Cong.): *Provided*, That not to exceed \$5,000,000 of such prior year funds appropriated to the Department of the Army shall be available for the purposes of advance planning as authorized by section 504 of the act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155, 82d Cong.).

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to section 802. I understand in that section is a provision for what is known as the Point Aux Pins Ammunition Depot along the Alabama-Mississippi line. There is nothing specifically in the bill on that point, but in the report of the committee on page 43 we find a paragraph which in substance directs how the proposed channel shall be constructed.

I want to further call the attention of the committee to the fact that when this authorization was under consideration in the Senate committee on military and naval construction, that committee reporting on that particular authorization on page 4 made a statement to the effect that this proposed channel was being considered in connection with another channel. I shall not take the time of the committee to go into detail. That is on page 4 of the report to which I have just referred.

The language of the Senate committee, to which I have just referred, and the language of this Committee on Appropriations providing funds for that project are in direct conflict. I am sure that it was not the intention of the Committee on Appropriations to arbitrarily spell out just how that channel should be constructed. I rather think that the Committee on Appropriations was not familiar in full with what was under consideration.

I would like to just briefly point out that if the directive in the report of the Committee on Appropriations is followed by the Army engineers, that they could only build this channel straight to the gulf from this proposed depot. Now, it so happens that just about 10 miles from that point there is another channel, an existing channel, leading from the mainland to the gulf known as the Pascagoula Channel, connecting the port of Pascagoula with the Gulf of Mexico. It is quite a port of entry. Now, the Army engineers have been requested to consider the feasibility and the practicability of connecting these two channels

rather than to build an entirely new channel which would serve this one project.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. The Army engineers were asked to consider by the Senate committee the feasibility of tying these channels in together, in other words, to tie them in with the existing economy of the port of Pascagoula.

Mr. Chairman, this is a defense project. The object of what we are trying to do there is to establish another defense project, namely, the establishment of an oil refinery which would produce oil which would be exported and, of course, would be used just as much in the defense effort if it is needed as would this ammunition depot. So, it would serve both purposes. All I am asking here now is that in view of these circumstances and without any further discussion of it that the chairman of the committee, in view of this statement, make such a statement for the benefit of the Record as he sees fit that will give the Army engineers an opportunity, which they have already been authorized to do by another committee of the Congress, to see whether or not ours is a practical and feasible proposition.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I have no objection if the Army wants to study into this any further. I think the decision the Army has to make is whether this ammunition terminal is important enough to go ahead with now or whether they want to delay it in order to make this further study. The justifications which were submitted to us were on the basis of the direct route to the sea. That was the basis on which testimony was taken from representatives of the Army by our subcommittee. Now, subsequently, information was brought to our attention that there had been a statement in the report by the Senate committee asking the Army to look into this alternate route. It appears, however, that the alternate route mentioned is not authorized as a civil-works project as yet. There are these two rather important circumstances; first of all, that this alternate route would probably cost something in excess of \$1 million more than would the route that we are now talking about and which was justified to our subcommittee. Secondly, that because this alternate route by way of Pascagoula is not authorized, it might result in unreasonable delay in getting the facilities going. Those are the only two considerations that must be kept in mind.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, may I say to my friend—and I realize I am laboring under difficulties here—that the testimony of General Carter before the gentleman's committee was to the effect

that there was a possibility that it might cost \$200,000 or \$300,000 more. But my understanding is that they have come to no definite figure; and, furthermore, the Army engineers are now actively engaged—they are down there now making this survey.

So all I am asking the Committee to do is to leave the matter open. Incidentally, Jackson County, where this project is going to be located, is going to contribute \$2 million toward this project. We are just asking the opportunity to let them work it out. That is all we are asking.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The situation at present, as I see it, is that in view of the language in the report of the Senate committee and the authorizing language, that this is now under study, that now it is up to the Army to decide whether or not this is important enough to go ahead with the project as funded by our committee or whether they would prefer to wait until the final returns are in.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman has no objection to a further study?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am quite sure that if there is one pending I am not going to attempt to make any objection to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in carrying out the provisions of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended (50 U. S. C., App. 2251-2297), including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); reimbursement of the Civil Service Commission for full field investigations of employees occupying positions of critical importance from the standpoint of national security; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with civil defense functions; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; not to exceed \$9,000 for the purchase of newspapers, periodicals, and teletype news services; and not to exceed \$6,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses to be expended under the direction of the Administrator for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive; \$8,525,000.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HYDE: On page 27, line 20, after "\$8,525,000", strike out the period and insert "Provided, That no part of the funds herein appropriated may be used to remove the Civil Defense Training Center from Olney, Md."

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will neither increase nor decrease the amount of the appropriation. It will, however, save the Government, I believe, something over a half million dollars. We are merely seeking in this amendment to prevent the removal of the civil defense training center from its present location. If it is removed—and no real reason, no good reason has been given for its removal—it will cost the Government something over \$300,000; and, in addition to that, the Government will lose about a quarter of a million dollars investment that it already has in the present civil defense train-

ing center. Should this agency be moved from Olney, there would be an immediate loss to the Government of about a half a million dollars as well as a loss of other facilities, including a pumping plant, a microwave tower, a telephone tower constructed by the telephone company—and incidentally, in the contract there is a provision for the payment of \$150,000 to the telephone company in the event the installation is removed—and the removal of a complete communication system and a complete rescue street installation of numerous building wrecks, at a cost of well over a quarter of a million dollars.

Mr. Chairman, there is no good reason for the removal of this center. There is no good reason why the Government should spend well over half a million dollars simply for the purpose of removing it from one place to another.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Is it not also true, because of the fact that Olney is very close to the Nation's Capital, that we can encourage many people to come to Olney to take the civil defense course?

Mr. HYDE. That is certainly so, which would not be true of some other location.

So, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the adoption of this amendment. I believe there is no strong opposition to the amendment.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, with 5 minutes for the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] and 5 minutes for the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is obviously one to tie the hands of the Civil Defense organization, which has for the last 6 months under the direction of the President been looking to find a location in Government-owned facilities. The school, or whatever they call it, at Olney which the gentleman from Maryland hopes to retain there is now occupying land that is under condemnation procedure. It is worth from \$44,000 to \$48,000, and the owner would like to obtain something like \$750,000 from the Government for it.

It so happens that after looking over many installations throughout the country the Civil Defense organization, its administration officers, and so forth, decided to occupy a Government facility in Battle Creek, Mich., in my district. This facility has a replacement value of some \$30 to \$35 million. It stands vacant out there. Under an executive order, the Civil Defense is already moving out there.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. May I say to the gentleman that the testimony before the committee with regard to this matter indicated that the Olney location was in no wise satisfactory, that the question at that time was whether or not this headquarters for Civil Defense would be moved to Indiantown Gap, Pa., or to Battle Creek, Mich.

Mr. SHAFER. That is right.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. May I say from another angle that the General Services Administration comes to our subcommittee. We have attempted definitely to give the authority to the General Services Administration to find use for these buildings. I made a trip to Battle Creek, taking a clerk of the committee along with me, and I found that that is a beautiful location. It has no correlation to the ordinary hospital that we think about or anything else that might be used. It is an excellent location for some Government agency. This Government agency, with the general approval of the General Services Administration, is now moving into it.

Mr. SHAFER. And by direction of the President to occupy Government-owned facilities rather than rental property. I believe the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Do I understand that they are moving into a hospital—a Government owned hospital?

Mr. SHAFER. It is known as a hospital, but it is a much better facility than a hospital actually. It is not a hospital—it was used as a hospital. It is a former sanitarium, but it is a \$30 million to \$35 million building, with excellent office facilities and parking spaces.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Is there suitable ground around there to carry out all of these other functions?

Mr. SHAFER. Yes, there is ample ground.

Mr. DEVEREUX. My understanding is that we did not object to the movement of the headquarters from Olney. It was simply the movement of the school from Olney.

Mr. SHAFER. It will tie the hands of the Civil Defense authorities in their future plans. There is no question about that.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. As a disinterested person in this argument, may I say it is a splendid building surrounded by a big park. It is not a hospital. If you would look at it, you would not think of it as a hospital. It is well designed architecturally and it looms up like a hotel. There are many facilities that they could not possibly get in any other location. I think the gentleman would do well to look at it.

Mr. SHAFER. There are 10½ acres of land there for parking or other purposes which could be used by civilian defense—Government-owned property, at a rental saving annually of at least \$250,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and to support the position taken by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER]. As a member of the subcommittee, we heard testimony on this proposal on the budget for the Civil Defense Authority. The testimony indicated that they had exhaustively gone into the conditions at the site of Olney and had come to the conclusion that the site was inadequate for their long-range plans, and that they were considering moving to one of several sites, Indiantown Gap, Pa., or Battle Creek, Mich. As I understand it, after a full investigation of all the possibilities, the executive branch of the Government felt that the Government-owned site at Battle Creek, Mich., which is presently not used, was the most desirable site that they could find for their overall program. I understand one of the major factors in their decision was the fact that they could save about \$200,000 to \$250,000 annually in the operation of their agency by such a move from Olney to Battle Creek.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. HYDE. Does the gentleman understand that this amendment applies not to the civil defense headquarters but it applies merely to the training center for which there is now a building at Olney? There is this installation, for example, known as Rescue Street on which there are any number of buildings in various stages of destruction to simulate a destroyed town, which would have to be entirely done away with and which would have to be reconstructed in a new location, and that the loss on that installation alone would cost over a quarter of a million dollars on what has already been invested there to say nothing of the cost of removal to the new location, which expense in itself would be more than enough to pay for the entire location at Olney.

Mr. FORD. It is my understanding that all of those factors of initial cost of construction at Olney, the cost of doing whatever is necessary at Battle Creek, plus the comparative cost between what they pay now and what they will have to pay at Battle Creek for annual maintenance and operation were taken into consideration and in the estimation of the Civil Defense authorities, based upon what they consider essential in the overall civilian defense picture, they feel that Battle Creek is the best possible site that they could get and, consequently, I sincerely hope that the decision of the executive branch will be upheld and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland will be defeated.

Mr. HYDE. I have one further question. There is another matter which was not thrashed out before the subcommittee.

Mr. FORD. I think that is correct, that we get the benefit of the decision of the executive branch of the Government. That is a decision which is the responsibility primarily of the executive branch, and consequently all we got was a report as to what the facts were and

on what basis they predicated their views.

I repeat again, Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment is defeated so that this movement for the best interests of the Civil Defense and in the best interests of the country as a whole will take place as rapidly as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the act of August 13, 1953 (67 Stat. 576), including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not to exceed \$50 per diem in lieu of subsistence for members of the Commission serving without compensation; purchase of not to exceed 2 passenger motor vehicles; and entertainment, \$170,000.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCULLOCH: Page 28, lines 18 and 19, after the semicolon in line 18, strike the remainder of the line and all of line 19 and insert in lieu thereof "\$25,000."

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, in the dying days of the 1st session of the 83d Congress, Subcommittee No. 4 of the Judiciary Committee, out of consideration for the patriotism of our people and in due respect to the courage of those Founding Fathers who hallowed the ground at Jamestown, at Williamsburg, and at Yorktown, favorably reported a Senate joint resolution, which later became Public Law 263, which was approved by the President on August 13, 1953.

That joint resolution was reported out of Subcommittee No. 4 and out of the full Judiciary Committee only after the entire section, which authorized an appropriation, was stricken from the bill. I feel sure I am safe in saying to the members of the committee that neither the subcommittee nor the full Committee on the Judiciary would have favorably reported that joint resolution had the amendment striking the section in question not been agreed to.

In the meantime those who are interested in this celebration—and I think it is a fine thing and I am wholeheartedly in support of the celebration down there—are requesting an appropriation of \$170,000, which will be requested for each of 3 years during the time this celebration will continue.

Let me enumerate some of the items covered by this \$170,000, according to testimony before our committee, which will be found on page 1105 and the several following pages of the printed hearings. In the first place 12 full-time employees would be hired, 5 of whom would receive \$9,600, or more, a year, each. In addition, \$35,000 of this sum would be paid to consultants who are authorized to travel to France and to Britain and to expend as much as \$15,000 for traveling expenses. In addition, this Commission, pursuant to this budget, would be authorized to buy 2 new passenger automobiles, would be authorized to buy 5 intercommunication systems, 5 brandnew typewriters, 2 dictaphone transcribers, and other items

along that line, when all the time there are in the GSA similar items that could be used to good advantage.

I repeat, this Commission is intended to function for 3 years which means, at this rate, that it will ultimately cost \$510,000. My amendment would reduce the appropriation to \$25,000 a year.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I feel sure that the gentleman has stated it correctly when he says that no member of the Committee on the Judiciary ever had any impression that such a sum as \$170,000 and that much for each of 3 years would be spent on this celebration. Our committee, as the gentleman knows, takes a position with regard to these celebrations that it wants to foster patriotism, but it certainly does not intend that such large expenditures shall be made. I shall support the gentleman's amendment and I hope it will be agreed to.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. As a matter of fact, the Committee on the Judiciary by unanimous vote deleted a section authorizing an appropriation?

Mr. McCULLOCH. That is exactly right. As I stated at the very beginning, the committee, as I recall, unanimously struck the entire section which would have authorized an appropriation.

I am chairman of the subcommittee to which all of these bills proposing celebrations are referred and, like my good friend, the gentleman from New York, I am also interested in fostering patriotism, love of country and indoctrinating the youth of the land with the courage, foresight and the political know-how of the founders of this country. If we are to be confronted with appropriations of this size for every bill that comes to us for the celebration of such affairs, I am fearful that in the future no celebration bills will be approved by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. May I ask the gentleman if at about the same time we approved a bill for the celebration of the anniversary of Columbia University, also a celebration of our independence at Philadelphia, and in both cases with agreement by the sponsors of those bills we deleted all authorization for appropriation of Federal funds?

Mr. McCULLOCH. The answer to both of the questions is unequivocally "Yes." It was by the consideration of the members of the Committee on the Judiciary and in that course of action that this joint resolution was favorably reported.

I hope that the committee will approve the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH].

Mr. Chairman, I assure you that this celebration which is proposed at Jamestown, Williamsburg, and Yorktown is one of the most important celebrations that has ever taken place in the United States of America. But this is much more than a celebration.

In the first place, 1957 will be the 350th anniversary of the founding of America. In 1607 at Jamestown there was established the first permanent English settlement on the North American Continent.

Moreover, 1957 will mark the 175th anniversary of the surrender at Yorktown where our Nation won its independence. Strangely enough, the 175 years that have followed that event are exactly the same number of years as Virginia remained a colony.

Mr. Chairman, this Government has recognized the importance of this area and has established there the Colonial National Historical Park. It embraces the 3 locations of Yorktown, Jamestown, and Williamsburg, which are not more than 24 miles apart. Williamsburg is in the center with Yorktown 12 miles on one side and Jamestown 12 miles on the other. The Federal Government plans during the coming years to put certain public installations in that national memorial. They have already spent large sums of money there and will spend additional sums in the future. Now, what the Government is being asked to do in this instance is merely to accelerate work already planned on this national memorial so that it will be available to the thousands and thousands of citizens who will visit the celebration which will take place in 1957. A national Federal commission has been established to supervise this work and to advise with the Department of the Interior. That Commission has been appointed by the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate, and the Speaker of this body. The Commission is not going to limit its activities to this celebration; it will advise the Department of the Interior in planning the park that will memorialize the most historic events in the history of America so that future generations may go there and pay homage to our forefathers who established this great land, pay homage to the cradle of democracy that nurtured those men who made this Nation great, men such as Jefferson, Marshall, and others of that character. This park will ever be a memorial to the flowering of democracy, and I believe that the Members of this House will agree that if there ever was a time that we should reaffirm our faith in democracy it is today, when a contrary ideology is gaining strength in the world.

This area of Virginia has in it many firsts. It was not only the first permanent English settlement in America; the first legislative body that ever sat on American soil held its first session in Jamestown in 1619.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. The first law school in America was established at Williamsburg. The second oldest college in America is located at Williamsburg. The landing of the first Negroes in this country took place within this area; the first port of entry, the first customhouse, the first iron factory, the first glass works, and the beginnings of many other American political and economic activities.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to impose any longer on the patience of this House at this late hour. I believe that the Members of this House realize the importance of this great celebration and the work that should be done by the Federal Government to improve this national memorial park so that it will be ready for this celebration. I respectfully urge that the committee vote down this amendment.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I think it should be pointed out that this was not a request which was initiated by the Congress but one that was initiated and submitted to the Committee on Appropriations by the executive branch of the Government, and the amount included was presented by the President in his budget proposal.

Mr. GARY. I thank my distinguished colleague from Michigan for his contribution. That is absolutely correct. It is not an amount asked by the State of Virginia. It was the amount asked by the Department of the Interior and the President, through the Interior Department. The Department of the Interior will administer these funds which will be spent under the proper guidance of this committee and the Interior Department.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], who preceded me, spoke very eloquently about early American history. No man could have presented a case on the floor more fluently, more earnestly than the gentleman from Virginia. But I am a bit concerned and perhaps a bit confused by some of the things that go on.

We have a distinguished gentleman from the State of Virginia whose name is a household word throughout the United States for economy. Periodically I get a report from his committee pointing out the necessity of cutting down Federal appropriations; cutting down the number of personnel, cutting down the number of automobiles. Here, to my amazement, we have some distinguished citizens from his State who come before the Congress of the United States and ask for funds. For what purpose? For another commission; for two more automobiles; to increase the number of employees in the Federal service.

Are we on one hand to talk about curtailing the number of personnel, the number of automobiles, the amount of

Government expenditures and then on the other hand appropriate more money?

I do not like to do things that way. I think there are many other Members of the House who do not like to do things that way. It is one thing to preach economy. It is one thing to hold oneself up as an example of economy. It is another thing to practice that and to put it into effect.

The people of the State of Virginia are excellent Americans. They are good people. They are good citizens. Their Representatives in Congress can only be as good as they permit them to be. Here we have had an example on the question of economy, in the delegation from the State of Virginia requesting funds from the Federal Government. Let's be consistent.

I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] is agreed to.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the chairman of our Judiciary Subcommittee No. 4, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch]. I represented our committee on the floor when the bill creating this commission last year passed under unanimous consent.

I want to call attention to a very unusual situation that we face here. Frequently, when we are considering appropriation bills, we hear the argument made that Congress, through its legislative committees and by action of the House, has authorized a Federal activity, and that the Appropriations Committee should not be allowed to destroy that program which the Congress has ordered. Now we find the contrary of that situation. We find a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary has considered an item in a bill that was before it containing an authorization for an appropriation of Federal funds and that subcommittee expressly and consciously deleted that section from the bill and in that fashion it was approved by the full Committee on the Judiciary and in that fashion approved, under unanimous consent, by the House of Representatives. Notwithstanding the fact that Congress had expressed itself as not authorizing Federal funds for that purpose, now we come in here and have an appropriation of \$170,000 for 3 years to celebrate an historical event.

One reason I am disturbed about this is that at the same time we had bills before us to celebrate an anniversary of Columbia University and also the Independence celebration in Philadelphia, both of which originally contained very minor appropriations, something on the order of \$10,000 or \$15,000. The Judiciary Committee and the subcommittee, after discussion with the sponsors of those programs, deleted, with their consent, any authorization for an appropriation.

If we are to commence setting up commissions with five employees getting over \$9,600 a year to work for 3 years in preparation for an historical event, and every State has historical events that it is proud of, there will be no end to the

creation of these commissions and the expenditure of public funds, especially if it can be done when the Congress has expressly denied the authorization of funds for a purpose of this character.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I think the Members in voting on this amendment should bear in mind that many of us from time to time have such projects, in which we are interested, and genuinely interested. If this procedure of creating these commissions and having these celebrations is abused by Congress voting an expenditure of unjustified funds, it certainly will react adversely against other celebrations and to the detriment of many other Members of the House.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman.

May I add out of my own experience that within this month the city of Jackson, Mich., in my district, put on a celebration of the founding of the city and also the founding of the Republican Party in Jackson, Mich., on July 6, 1854. The citizens of that community gave of their time and gave of their funds and put on a celebration that was really worthwhile, yet they did not ask the Federal Government for any money for a purpose of that kind.

I think if we establish the precedent of setting up a Federal commission with high-paid employees and \$69,000 for miscellaneous expenses there will be no end to the expense that will come out of the Federal Treasury, because you will find difficulty in distinguishing between Virginia, Massachusetts, New York, Philadelphia, and Michigan.

I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio perhaps leaves too much money by giving \$25,000 in this appropriation since there was no appropriation authorized originally in the legislation, but I am going to support his amendment because as a practical matter perhaps some reliance has been placed upon the approval by the Interior Department of this item in the budget.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In 1949 or 1950 the House of Representatives voted \$2 million for a sesquicentennial celebration in Washington, D. C. I fought that raid on the Treasury. There was proposed to be built down in Foggy Bottom, along the Anacostia River, a lot of fancy buildings, and so on and so forth. That ended up in the biggest boondoggle of its kind of all time. About the only thing the people got out of that \$2 million appropriation was a bunch of payrollers and a band shell that floats on the Potomac River. Let us not make that kind of a mistake twice.

Mr. MEADER. I may say in closing that the \$170,000 sought to be appropriated to the Commission will not produce any buildings. Any improvements such as roads or any other structures in a national memorial park come out of a totally different appropriation in far

larger amounts. The \$170,000 does nothing but pay salaries and operate the commission for a year.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GARY) there were—ayes 85, noes 41.

So the amendment was agreed on.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1111. (a) After the date of enactment hereof no amount shall be recorded as an obligation of the Government of the United States unless it is supported by documentary evidence of—

(1) a binding agreement in writing between the parties thereto, in a manner and form and for a purpose authorized by law, executed before the expiration of the period of availability for obligation of the appropriation or fund concerned for specific goods to be delivered, real property to be purchased or leased, or work or services to be performed; or

(2) a valid loan agreement, showing the amount of the loan to be made and the terms of repayment thereof; or

(3) an order required by law to be placed with a Government agency; or

(4) an order issued pursuant to a law authorizing purchases without advertising when necessitated by public exigency or for perishable subsistence supplies or within specific monetary limitations; or

(5) a grant or subsidy payable (i) from appropriations made for payment of or contributions toward, sums required to be paid in specific amounts fixed by law or in accord with formulae prescribed in law, or (ii) pursuant to agreement authorized by, or plans approved in accord with and authorized by, law; or

(6) a liability which may result from pending litigation brought under authority of law; or

(7) employment or services of persons or expenses of travel in accord with law, and services performed by public utilities; or

(8) any other legal liability of the United States against an appropriation or fund legally available therefor.

(b) Not later than September 30 of each year, the head of each Federal agency shall certify, as to each appropriation or fund under the control of such agency, the amount thereof remaining obligated but unexpended and the amount thereof remaining unobligated on June 30 of such year and copies of such certification shall be forwarded by him to the chairmen of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, to the Comptroller General of the United States, and to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the duty of making certifications as required by this subsection shall not be delegated: *Provided*, That such certification for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, shall be made not later than October 31, 1954, and shall include only such obligations as could have been recorded under the provisions of subsection (a) hereof.

(c) Each certification made pursuant to subsection (b) shall be supported by records evidencing the amounts which are certified therein as having been obligated and such records shall be retained in the agency in such form as to facilitate audit and reconciliation for such period as may be necessary for such purposes.

(d) No appropriation or fund which is limited for obligation purposes to a definite period of time shall be available for expenditure after the expiration of such period except for liquidation of amounts obligated in accord with subsection (a) hereof; but no such appropriation or fund shall remain

available for expenditure for any period beyond that otherwise authorized by law.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS: On page 40, after line 9, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"(e) Any statement of obligation of funds furnished by any agency of the Government to the Congress or any committee thereof shall include only such amounts as may be valid obligations as defined in subsection (a) hereof."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment to the definition of an obligation which has been prepared over the winter, and the amendment has been drawn up by the clerk of the Committee on Appropriations. As far as I am concerned, I am prepared to accept it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we are glad to accept the amendment.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, section 1111 is legislation on an appropriation bill, but it is the kind of legislation that comes most appropriately from the Appropriations Committee; it is very good, carefully drawn, much-needed legislation, and I congratulate the Committee on Appropriations on this section.

But they have been a little selfish about it. They have applied their carefully limited definition of a Government obligation only to certifications to the Appropriations Committees. My amendment would make it apply to reports to all committees of Congress.

I have been interested in this subject for years, as we have reviewed in the Foreign Affairs Committee the growing unexpended balances in the ECA, MOAP, MSA, and FOA programs. Everyone agrees that, in considering whether a department or agency has any leftover funds, money that the Government is already legally, actually obligated to spend should be considered in all honesty as already spent, insofar as congressional action is concerned. A true, legal, actual obligation of the United States Government should not be any more subject to rescission, reduction, or change by Congress than money already spent, even though the money was spent unwisely or dishonestly. But what has been the result of this simple, natural, honest view of a Government obligation? Departmental and agency people, in their determination to hold on to leftover funds, unused funds, to prevent their reverting to the Treasury; to tie the hands of Congress in considering whether the agency needs these funds, have adopted the device of pasting the labels obligation or obligated balance all over such funds. We have all heard stories of the feverish rush in Government offices to get funds obligated toward the end of a fiscal year by bookkeeping and accounting maneuvers that bar reconsideration by Congress but leave the agency free to do as it pleases with such funds.

This section, as amended, may stop such monkey business. Cynics may say

that it will result in actual overobligating and extravagance. I think not. I think, however, we need to be considering some penalties that might be applied both to fictitious labeling of obligations and to overobligating.

In any case, this section as amended, will help the work of both the Appropriation and the legislative committees. Executive juggling between the authorization and appropriation stages of legislation accounts for a lot of overspending. This will help to stop this juggling by at least giving the same kind of figures to all congressional committees.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9936) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Preston amendment, the airport amendment; and on the Wigglesworth amendment for ship construction.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put the other amendments en bloc.

The other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PRESTON: On page 6, line 8, add:

"CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION—FEDERAL-AID AIRPORT PROGRAM, FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

"For carrying out the provisions of the Federal Airport Act of May 13, 1946, as amended (except section 5 (a)), \$22 million, of which (1) \$20 million shall be for projects in the States in accordance with section 6 of said act, (2) \$250,000 for projects in Puerto Rico, (3) \$50,000 for projects in the Virgin Islands, (4) \$225,000 for projects in the Territory of Hawaii, (5) \$225,000 for projects in the Territory of Alaska, and (6) \$1,250,000 shall be available as one fund for necessary planning, research, and administrative expenses (including not to exceed \$125,000 'Civil Aeronautics Administration,' for necessary administrative expenses, in-

cluding the maintenance and operation of aircraft): *Provided*, That the amount made available herein for administrative expenses shall be in addition to the amount made available for such purposes in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1955."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 144, noes 42.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and forty-three Members are present, a quorum.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Page 6, line 11, after the words "ship construction", strike out all of lines 11, 12, and 13, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"For payment of construction-differential subsidy and cost of national-defense features incident to construction of 4 passenger-cargo ships under title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U. S. C. 1154); for reconditioning and betterment of not to exceed 4 ships in the national-defense reserve fleet; and for necessary expenses for the acquisition of used tankers pursuant to section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U. S. C. 1160), and the payment of cost of national-defense features incorporated in new tankers constructed to replace such used tankers, \$82,600,000: *Provided*, That appropriations granted herein shall be available to pay construction-differential subsidy granted by the Federal Maritime Board, pursuant to section 501 (c) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to aid in the reconstruction of any Mariner-class ships sold under the provisions of title VII of the 1936 act. *Provided further*, That all ship construction, reconditioning and betterment of vessels appropriated for herein be performed in shipyards in the continental United States."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 159, noes 44.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H. R. 10009.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 257. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings relative to the contribution of atomic energy to medicine.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 96. Concurrent resolution to extend the greetings and felicitations of Congress to Hon. Herbert Hoover on the 80th anniversary of his birth, August 10, 1954.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2670) entitled "An act to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of certain tribes, bands, and colonies of Indians in the State of Utah and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and appoints Mr. WATKINS, Mr. DWORSHAK, and Mr. ANDERSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 252) entitled "An act to permit all civil actions against the United States for recovery of taxes erroneously or illegally assessed or collected to be brought in the district courts with right of trial by jury."

FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT TAX

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5173) to provide that the excess of collections from the Federal unemployment tax over unemployment compensation administrative expenses shall be used to establish and maintain a \$200 million reserve in the Federal unemployment account which will be available for advances to the States, to provide that the remainder of such excess shall be returned to the States, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "1953" and insert "1954".

Page 2, line 13, strike out "unemployment" and insert "employment security".

Page 3, line 2, strike out "unemployment" and insert "employment security".

Page 3, line 6, strike out "unemployment" and insert "employment security".

Page 3, strike out all after line 7 over to and including line 4 on page 4 and insert:

"(1) The aggregate of the amounts expended during the fiscal year for the purpose of assisting the States in (A) the administration of their unemployment compensation laws (including administration pursuant to agreements under title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952), (B) the establishment and maintenance of

systems of public employment offices in accordance with the act of June 6, 1933, as amended (29 U. S. C., sec. 49-49n), and (C) carrying into effect section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; and

"(2) the amount estimated by the Secretary of Labor as equal to the necessary expenses incurred during the fiscal year for the performance by the Department of Labor of its functions (except its functions with respect to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands) under (i) this title and titles III and XII of this act, and (ii) the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, (iii) the provisions of the act of June 6, 1933, as amended, (iv) title IV (except sec. 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and (v) title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Act of 1952; and".

Page 4, line 5, strike out "(2)" and insert "(3)".

Page 4, strike out lines 11, 12, and 13.

Page 5, line 17, after "Labor", insert "and certified by him to the Secretary of the Treasury on or before that date".

Page 5, line 17, after "States", insert "to the Secretary of Labor by June 1".

Page 5, line 22, strike out "June 1" and insert "May 1".

Page 5, line 24, strike out "June 1" and insert "May 1".

Page 8, line 13, strike out "account" and insert "unemployment fund".

Page 8, line 22, after "subsection", insert "and".

Page 8, strike out all after line 22 over to and including line 3 on page 9.

Page 9, line 4, strike out "(4)" and insert "(3)".

Page 9, line 5, strike out "(1), (2), and (3)" and insert "(1) and (2)".

Page 9, line 7, strike out "shall, from time to time, certify" and insert "shall certify."

Page 10, line 15, strike out "(a)".

Page 10, line 18, after "shall", insert "promptly".

Page 10, lines 18 and 19, strike out "as of the close of the calendar month in which the Governor makes such request".

Page 10, line 20, after "the", insert "unemployment trust fund for credit to the".

Page 11, line 5, strike out "subsection (a)" and insert "section 1201".

Page 11, line 8, after "paid", insert ", received, and covered into the Treasury".

Page 11, lines 9 and 10, strike out "subsection (a)" and insert "section 1201".

Page 11, line 10, after "the" where it appears the second time insert "unemployment trust fund for credit to the".

Page 11, lines 14 and 15, strike out "from time to time from the general fund in" and insert "at the close of the month in which the moneys were covered into".

Page 11, line 15, after "the", where it appears the second time insert "unemployment trust fund for credit to the".

Page 11, line 16, after "be", insert ", as of the first day of the succeeding month".

Page 11, line 18, strike out "from time to time".

Page 11, line 20, strike out "title." and insert "title".

Page 11, after line 20, insert:

"Sec. 1203. When used in this title, the term 'governor' shall include the Commissioners of the District of Columbia."

Page 12, line 16, strike out "second" and insert "fourth".

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide that the excess of collections from the Federal unemployment tax over unemployment compensation administrative expenses shall be used to establish and maintain a \$200 million reserve in the Federal unemployment account which will be available for advances to the States, to provide that the remainder of such excess shall be returned to the States, and for other purposes."

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, only two of the Senate amendments are of importance. The others are purely technical, clerical, or clarifying in nature.

The first amendment of substance eliminates the requirement that a State maintain an average 2.7-percent tax during the quarter in which application is made for an advance in order to be eligible for the advance. This will avoid compelling States as a condition of eligibility for a loan to make sharp increases in employers' contributions during periods of high unemployment when they are least able to meet such increases.

The second amendment relates to the repayment of advances obtained by the States. Under the House bill, repayment of the advances obtained by States were to be made by either (a) transfer of funds from the trust account of the borrowing State—at the direction of its governor—to the Federal unemployment account, or (b) a decrease in the 90-percent allowable credit against the 3-percent Federal unemployment tax. Under the House bill, this decrease in allowable tax credits would have begun after the second January 1 on which outstanding advances have not been repaid by transfer of funds from the State's trust fund. Under the Senate amendment, the decrease in allowable credits will not begin until after the fourth—rather than the second—January 1 on which such conditions exist.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the Senate amendments have been examined by those of us on this side, and we are in agreement with the request made by the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of H. R. 8932, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to reclassify dictaphones by transferring them from their existing tariff classification under paragraph 1542 of the Tariff Act to a new provision under paragraph 372.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph 372 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U. S. C., sec. 1001, par. 372) is hereby amended by inserting after "cash registers, 25 percent ad valorem;" the following: "business dictating, recording, and transcribing machines, chiefly used in business offices of the type or types recording on nonmagnetizable recording medium, and parts thereof, 15 percent ad valorem."

Sec. 2. Paragraph 1542 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U. S. C., sec. 1001, par. 1542) is

hereby amended by striking out the word "dictaphones."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this act shall take effect at the close of the 30th day after the day on which this act is enacted.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That paragraph 372 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U. S. C., sec. 1001, par. 372) is hereby amended by inserting after 'cash registers, 25 percent ad valorem;' the following: 'business dictating, recording, and transcribing machines, chiefly used in business offices, of the type or types recording on nonmagnetizable recording medium, and parts thereof, 30 percent ad valorem;'

"Sec. 2. Paragraph 1542 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U. S. C., sec. 1001, par. 1542) is hereby amended by striking out 'dictaphones,' in each place it appears therein.

"Sec. 3. Nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting in any manner existing international obligations of the United States with respect to the duty on the articles inserted by the first section of this act in paragraph 372 of the Tariff Act of 1930, and the rate of duty of 15 percent ad valorem presently applied to such articles under paragraph 1542 of such act, as modified pursuant to such international obligations, shall continue to be applied to such articles and to be subject to modification or termination in the same manner and to the same extent as under existing law.

"Sec. 4. The amendments made by this act shall take effect at the close of the 30th day after the day on which this act is enacted."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the new paragraph would include business dictating, recording, and transcribing machines, chiefly used in business offices, of the type or types recording on nonmagnetized recording medium, and parts thereof.

The present tariff status of dictaphones is that they are now classified in paragraph 1542 of the tariff act in the sundries schedule along with gramophones and musical instruments. They are dutiable at 15 percent ad valorem under paragraph 1542, the rate having been reduced from 30 percent in trade-agreement negotiations.

H. R. 8932 would transfer dictaphones from the sundries schedule contained in paragraph 1542 to paragraph 372 in the machinery schedule where it would be classified with various types of machinery, including office machines. The bill would continue the 15-percent rate applicable to dictaphones so that no change in duty is involved under your committee's bill. H. R. 8932 would, however, involve a change in nomenclature, and the new description would be "business dictating, recording, and transcribing machines, chiefly used in business offices, of the type or types recording on nonmagnetized recording medium."

The Committee on Ways and Means has been informed that, because dictaphones have been classified in the same paragraph along with phonographs and musical instruments, other countries have similarly classified them and as a result have imposed luxury taxes higher than would otherwise be the case. Favorable reports have been received on

H. R. 8932 from the Departments of the Treasury and Commerce.

The Committee on Ways and Means adopted an amendment to H. R. 8932 in the nature of a substitute which, in addition to clarifying and technical changes, incorporates changes designed to insure that the bill will not affect the rate of duty applicable to the articles covered by the bill. As introduced, the bill amends the Tariff Act of 1930, to provide for a 15-percent ad valorem duty for these articles. The rate now specified in the act for these articles is 30 percent, but the rate generally in effect has been reduced to 15 percent as a result of trade-agreement negotiations under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930. The committee amendment continues the 30-percent rate in the act, but provides that existing trade agreements, and the 15-percent rate established as a result of such agreements, shall continue to apply, until lawfully modified or terminated. Under the amendment, articles covered by the bill which are produced in any nation or area designated under section 5 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 as Communist-dominated or controlled will continue to be dutiable at the 30-percent rate. Another example of the effect of the amendment is that if the authority to apply reduced rates through trade agreements should be terminated and the statutory levels reinstated, the rate for the articles covered by the bill would revert to 30 percent rather than be fixed at 15 percent.

The Committee on Ways and Means was unanimous in recommending the enactment of H. R. 8932.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. R. 8300

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 260.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That there be printed 8,300 additional copies of the conference report on H. R. 8300, a bill to revise the internal-revenue laws of the United States, of which 1,000 shall be for the use of the Committee on Finance, 1,500 for the Senate document room, 3,000 for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means, 300 for the use of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and 2,500 for the House document room.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight Saturday to file a report on the Foreign Operations Administration appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF HON. HERBERT HOOVER

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution (S. Con. Res. 96).

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Congress of the United States thereby extends to the Honorable Herbert Hoover its greetings and felicitations on the 80th anniversary of his birth, August 10, 1954.

SEC. 2. The Congress expresses its admiration and gratitude to Mr. Hoover for his long years of devoted service to his native land and to the world in general in many different capacities.

SEC. 3. The Congress is especially appreciative of his willingness to accept cheerfully the heavy burden of serving as Chairman of the second Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, which is an arm of the Congress, in order to complete the work so well begun a few years ago by a similar commission under his chairmanship.

SEC. 4. The Congress expresses the hope and desire that divine providence may permit Herbert Hoover to be spared to give many more productive years of honored service to humanity and to his beloved country.

SEC. 5. A copy of this resolution shall be transmitted to America's elder statesman, the Honorable Herbert Hoover.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I might say that this is exactly the same concurrent resolution that was adopted by the House unanimously on yesterday. This has been adopted in the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman what the program is for the rest of the day. If all the gentleman intends is to proceed until we adopt the rule for the consideration of the atomic energy bill, and not go into general debate, and not have a night session, I shall not object. I think we would do better if we adopted the rule on the atomic energy bill and met tomorrow at 10 o'clock than to continue and debate the atomic energy bill tonight and then attempt to meet at 12 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will yield, I had hoped that we could proceed with the consideration of the atomic energy bill. Certainly the rule should be adopted. As I understand it, there will not be any considerable amount of time taken on the rule.

I have discussed the matter with the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], who is chairman of the committee. He would like to proceed with general debate this evening. Of course, that would not necessitate that all Members be present. Those who wanted to stay and participate in the debate or listen to it could do so and those who did not want to stay could read it in the RECORD in the morning at their leisure.

I appreciate what the gentleman has said, but I should like very much to dispose of that measure by tomorrow evening. Also, I might say to the gentleman, there are 17 citations from the Committee on Un-American Activities which we want to call up the first thing in the morning. It was suggested to me that there would be a vote on at least the first one, and I had hoped that that could be the quorum call in the morning.

I trust that the gentleman will not insist upon his suggestion that we do not proceed with general debate on the atomic energy bill this evening, at least for a while, and see what develops.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I do not know of any measure to come before this House for the remainder of this session, and in fact, I do not think of one that has come before the House thus far this session in which there is more interest among the Members of the House than in this atomic energy bill.

We have been here since 10 o'clock this morning. I am willing to stay until about 6 o'clock. I think that would be as late as I would be willing to remain here this evening. If we meet at 10 o'clock in the morning then, we will be fresh for further consideration of the business of the House.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, I recognize that it is the gentleman's privilege and right to take the position he does, to object to coming in at 10 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. RAYBURN. I do not object to coming in at 10 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. HALLECK. Do I understand the gentleman correctly that if we undertake to go beyond 6 o'clock he would feel constrained to oppose the unanimous-consent request that I made to come in at 10 o'clock in the morning?

Mr. RAYBURN. That is correct. I think if we adopt the rule, that should be sufficient. I should not object to sitting until 6 or perhaps a little longer for that purpose.

Mr. HALLECK. I think the rule will be adopted very quickly.

Mr. RAYBURN. If the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] wants to speak this evening, that is all right with me.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] wants to expedite this measure and the work of the House of Representatives as, I am quite sure, all of us do.

Mr. RAYBURN. Of course, I am very anxious, as I have said, to cooperate with the gentleman from Indiana on his goal of July 31. But I do not think we would expedite things by going beyond 6 o'clock this evening.

Mr. HALLECK. I think I understand the gentleman's position. Perhaps the gentleman will bear with me for a moment to make this observation.

Yesterday, during discussion of the postal pay and rate bill, the gentleman spoke of the fact that the House had not, under his tenure, employed this procedure involving a suspension of the rules and that he would never be a party to this trend toward denying the representatives of the people the right to express themselves. Checking back into the RECORD of May 19, 1952, I find that the gentleman from Texas, our beloved former Speaker, who was then Speaker, at that time entertained a motion to suspend the rules for the consideration of a bill to increase social-security payments by \$5. Also there was included in the bill under suspension of the rules a matter that was very objectionable to many of us, and we objected to the proceedings which prevented us from any amendment to strike out the objectionable matter. When I read the RECORD, I found that I made just about the same speech that the gentleman did yesterday with respect to what was being done. So the action yesterday certainly was not without precedent on the Democratic side.

Mr. RAYBURN. I will say to the gentleman that I also examined the RECORD. I said yesterday, as far as my memory went. But I will say that this is one time in my life my memory failed me.

Mr. CELLER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, is it proposed to meet on Saturday in the event we do not conclude consideration of the atomic energy bill tomorrow night?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes. I think undoubtedly if we did conclude it we would meet on Saturday. I would say to the gentleman that probably the matters that would be up then would not be of extreme importance or such as to require necessarily the presence of Members who had other arrangements or other things to do.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that I understand the situation. I want to cooperate with the leadership, but I feel that if the rule is brought up—and I have no objection to the hour's discussion of the rule, which can be brought up at this time, of course—then if general debate is to proceed into the evening, I will be constrained to object to meeting at 10 o'clock in the morning. I have no objection and I will have no objection to meeting at 10 o'clock in the morning providing we have an understanding that the rule will be disposed of tonight and the House will then adjourn.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield under his reservation of objection?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes, certainly.

Mr. HALLECK. A number of Members, including the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, have spoken to me about disposing of the omnibus rivers and harbors bill. They say it has a unanimous report and there is no controversy about it. Because I am just trying to get along with the things we have to do, I wonder if we might make an arrangement by which we would adopt the rule on the atomic energy bill, if it could be done in a few minutes, and then undertake to let the members of the Committee on Public Works dispose of the omnibus rivers and harbors bill this evening. The rule on that bill has already been adopted.

Mr. RAYBURN. How much general debate will there be on that bill?

Mr. DONDERO. Two hours. We think we can do it within an hour.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I suggest that we could proceed with the rivers and harbors bill. There is no urgency in disposing of the rule on the atomic energy bill without some discussion. It is an important bill. I think that 1 hour on the rule and 4 hours of general debate is certainly not too much.

Mr. HALLECK. I do not know of anyone who is going to oppose it, as far as I understand. I think everybody expects the measure must be taken up and disposed of.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I certainly do not intend to oppose the rule, but I have had many Members come to me and indicate their desire to obtain some time to speak. As we did agree to a 4-hour limitation on debate, it seems to me that the Members should have the right to use the hour of debate on the rule if they so desire.

Mr. HALLECK. As a matter of fact, I might say to the gentleman there are a number of Members on his side who principally come from one State in the South where they are having primaries next week who are very much interested in being here when the rivers and harbors bill is considered. It certainly would accommodate them if it could be disposed of. However, I do not know that there is more to be accomplished by prolonging this discussion.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, speaking of the rivers and harbors bill, there will be some controversy when that bill is brought up, and at least 3 or 4 amendments will be offered to it that will require time.

Mr. HALLECK. I think, Mr. Speaker, the only thing we can do is proceed with the rule on the Atomic Energy Commission bill and, under the suggestion of the gentleman from Texas, quit at 6 o'clock, and let matters go on.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have until midnight tomorrow to file a report on the bill, H. R. 7304.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

WATERSHED PROTECTION

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6788) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and local agencies in the planning and carrying out of works of improvement for soil conservation, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2297)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6788) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and local agencies in the planning and carrying out of works of improvement for soil conservation, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That erosion, floodwater, and sediment damages in the watersheds of the rivers and streams of the United States, causing loss of life and damage to property, constitute a menace to the national welfare; and that it is the sense of Congress that the Federal Government should cooperate with States and their political subdivisions, soil or water conservation districts, flood prevention or control districts, and other local public agencies for the purpose of preventing such damages and of furthering the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water and thereby of preserving and protecting the Nation's land and water resources.

"Sec. 2. For the purposes of this Act, the following terms shall mean:

"The 'Secretary'—the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States.

"Works of improvement'—any undertaking for—

"(1) flood prevention (including structural and land-treatment measures) or

"(2) agricultural phases of the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water

in watershed or subwatershed areas not exceeding two hundred and fifty thousand acres and not including any single structure which provides more than five thousand acre-feet of total capacity. No appropriation shall be made for any plan for works of improvement which includes any structure which provides more than twenty-five hundred acre-feet of total capacity unless such plan has been approved by resolutions adopted by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, respectively. A number of such subwatersheds when they are component parts of a larger watershed may be planned

together when the local sponsoring organizations so desire.

"Local organization'—any State, political subdivision thereof, soil or water conservation district, flood prevention or control district, or combinations thereof, or any other agency having authority under State law to carry out, maintain and operate the works of improvement.

"Sec. 3. In order to assist local organizations in preparing and carrying out plans for works of improvement, the Secretary is authorized, upon application of local organizations if such application has been submitted to, and not disapproved within 45 days by, the State agency having supervisory responsibility over programs provided for in this Act, or by the Governor if there is no State agency having such responsibility—

"(1) to conduct such investigations and surveys as may be necessary to prepare plans for works of improvement;

"(2) to make such studies as may be necessary for determining the physical and economic soundness of plans for works of improvement, including a determination as to whether benefits exceed costs;

"(3) to cooperate and enter into agreements with and to furnish financial and other assistance to local organizations: *Provided*, That, for the land-treatment measures, the Federal assistance shall not exceed the rate of assistance for similar practices under existing national programs;

"(4) to obtain the cooperation and assistance of other Federal agencies in carrying out the purposes of this section.

"Sec. 4. The Secretary shall require as a condition to providing Federal assistance for the installation of works of improvement that local organizations shall—

"(1) acquire without cost to the Federal Government such land, easements, or rights-of-way as will be needed in connection with works of improvement installed with Federal assistance;

"(2) assume such proportionate share of the cost of installing any works of improvement involving Federal assistance as may be determined by the Secretary to be equitable in consideration of anticipated benefits from such improvements: *Provided*, That no part of the construction cost for providing any capacity in structures for purposes other than flood prevention and features related thereto shall be borne by the Federal Government under the provisions of this Act;

"(3) make arrangements satisfactory to the Secretary for defraying costs of operating and maintaining such works of improvement, in accordance with regulations presented by the Secretary of Agriculture;

"(4) acquire, or provide assurance that landowners have acquired, such water rights, pursuant to State law, as may be needed in the installation and operation of the work of improvement; and

"(5) obtain agreements to carry out recommended soil conservation measures and proper farm plans from owners of not less than 50 per centum of the lands situated in the drainage area above each retention reservoir to be installed with Federal assistance.

"Sec. 5. At such time as the Secretary and the interested local organization have agreed on a plan for works of improvement, and the Secretary has determined that the benefits exceed the costs, and the local organization has met the requirements for participation in carrying out the works of improvement as set forth in section 4, the Secretary is authorized to assist such local organizations in developing specifications, in preparing contracts for construction, and to participate in the installation of such works of improvement in accordance with the plan: *Provided*, That, except as to the installation of works of improvement on Federal lands, the Secretary shall not construct or enter into any contract for the construction of

any structure unless there is no local organization authorized by State law to undertake such construction or to enter into such contract, and in no event after July 1, 1956: *Provided further*, That in participating in the installation of such works of improvement the Secretary, as far as practicable and consistent with his responsibilities for administering the overall national agricultural program, shall utilize the authority conferred upon him by the provisions of this Act: *Provided further*, That, at least forty-five days (counting only days occurring during any regular or special sessions of the Congress) before such installation involving Federal assistance is commenced, the Secretary shall transmit a copy of the plan and the justification therefor to the Congress through the President: *Provided further*, That any such plan (a) which includes reclamation or irrigation works or which affects public or other lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, or (b) which includes Federal assistance for floodwater detention structures, shall be submitted to the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of the Army, respectively, for his views and recommendations at least sixty days prior to transmission of the plan to the Congress through the President. The views and recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of the Army, if received by the Secretary of Agriculture prior to the expiration of the above sixty-day period, shall accompany the plan transmitted by the Secretary of Agriculture to the Congress through the President: *Provided further*, That, prior to any Federal participation in the works of improvement under this Act, the President shall issue such rules and regulations as he deems necessary or desirable to carry out the purposes of this Act, and to assure the coordination of the work authorized under this Act and related work of other agencies, including the Department of the Interior and the Department of the Army.

"Sec. 6. The Secretary is authorized in cooperation with other Federal and with States and local agencies to make investigations and surveys of the watersheds of rivers and other waterways as a basis for the development of coordinated programs. In areas where the programs of the Secretary of Agriculture may affect public or other lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to cooperate with the Secretary of Agriculture in the planning and development of works or programs for such lands.

"Sec. 7. The provisions of the Act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1570), as amended and supplemented, conferring authority upon the Department of Agriculture under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture to make preliminary examinations and surveys and to prosecute works of improvement for runoff and waterflow retardation and soil erosion prevention on the watersheds of rivers and other waterways are hereby repealed: *Provided*, That (a) the authority of the Department of Agriculture, under the direction of the Secretary, to prosecute the works of improvement for runoff and waterflow retardation and soil erosion prevention authorized to be carried out by that Department by the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), as amended, and (b) the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to undertake emergency measures for runoff retardation and soil erosion prevention authorized to be carried out by section 7 of the Act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1215), as amended by section 216 of the Act of May 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 163), shall not be affected by the provisions of this section.

"Sec. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, such sums to remain available until expended.

"SEC. 9. This Act may be cited as the 'Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,
WM. S. HILL,
HAROLD D. COOLEY.

Managers on the Part of the House.

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
EDWARD J. THYE,
B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND.

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6788) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and local agencies in the planning and carrying out of works of improvement for soil conservation, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to the amendment:

The Senate struck out all of the House language and the conference has agreed to the substitute for the Senate amendment. Following are the substantive changes:

Section 2: The conference agreed to the change made by the Senate in the form and punctuation of the definition of "works of improvement" to make it clear that the definition includes drainage projects and that it may be an undertaking either for flood prevention or the agricultural phases of the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water.

The House bill provided that the Secretary of Agriculture must come into agreement with the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives on all watershed projects. The Senate amendment struck out this provision and provided that any dam providing a capacity of from 2,000 to 5,000 acre-feet must be approved by the Congress. The conference agreement substitutes for these provisions a requirement that before appropriations can be made for any project containing any structure providing a capacity of from 2,500 to 5,000 acre-feet the plan must be approved by resolutions adopted by the Senate and House Agriculture Committees.

Under the new conference language, committee approval must be obtained before the necessary funds can be appropriated for a plan for works of improvement including a structure providing more than 2,500 acre-feet of total capacity. If an appropriation should be proposed without such committee approval such appropriation would be subject to a point of order. Although the conferees feel that such a proposal would not be made, it is their intent and understanding that a point of order can be made and sustained against appropriations for plans lacking committee approval.

The House defined "local organization" as including any agency having authority under State law to "carry out flood prevention and related activities." The Senate approved a definition, which was agreed upon by the conference, changing the quoted phrase to "carry out, maintain and operate the works of improvement."

Section 3: The Senate amendment added a provision to the House bill requiring approval of the application of the local organization by the appropriate State agency, or if there were no such State agency, by the Governor. The conference agreed to a substitute provision requiring applications to be submitted to the State authority but au-

thorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to proceed on such application unless it had been disapproved by the State agency, or the Governor in the absence of any authorized agency, within 45 days after submission of the application.

Section 4: Two technical amendments of the Senate were adopted making it clear that local organizations (1) would not be required to meet all of the requirements of section 4 before assistance in planning could be given, and (2) would not necessarily be required to defray "all" operating and maintenance costs.

The House provided that, among other conditions, local organizations would have to "furnish" without cost to the Federal Government such land, easements, or rights-of-way as would be needed in connection with installation of works of improvement before the Secretary could assist with such works of improvement. The Senate amended this provision by changing "furnish" to "acquire", and the conference agreed to the Senate amendment.

Section 5: The conference struck out language which had been added by the Senate to require that plans for works of improvement must be referred again to "the appropriate State agency" after their approval by the local organization and the Secretary.

The conference agreed to a Senate amendment broadening the basis for computing benefits in the determination that benefits exceed the cost of the proposed improvements.

The House bill authorized the Secretary to construct or to contract for the construction of structures installed in connection with works of improvement and the Senate deleted this authority. The conference agreed to permit the Secretary to undertake or contract for construction of structures only where no local organization is authorized by State law to contract for such installations, and then only until July 1, 1956. Conference language makes it clear, however, that the Secretary has and will continue to have authority to construct or contract for the installation of such structures in connection with such works of improvement as may be necessary on Federal lands.

The conference adopted a Senate provision requiring the submission of the plan to Congress to be made at least 45 session days before installation is commenced.

The Senate provision that the President shall issue regulations to assure coordination of the work authorized by the act with the related work of other agencies was adopted.

The conference agreed to the 60-day period provided by the House bill (rather than the 90-day period provided by the Senate amendment) for submission of views of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of the Army.

Section 6: The Senate provision authorizing cooperation by the Secretary of the Interior in the development of works on lands under his jurisdiction was adopted.

Section 7: The Senate provision preserving the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to undertake emergency measures for runoff retardation and soil erosion prevention under the Flood Control Act of 1938 was retained.

The conference changed the short title added by the Senate amendment to "Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act".

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,
WM. S. HILL,
HAROLD D. COOLEY.

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report. The conference

report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the adoption of this conference report marks the end of several years' activity on the part of the House Committee on Agriculture in an effort to obtain an effective and workable law to deal with small watersheds. In the course of that time the committee has held numerous hearings both in the field and in Washington as well as many conferences with officials of the Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of the Budget, representatives of conservation organizations, and others interested in a national program of soil and water conservation. Members of the committee have also discussed the legislation with the President and members of his staff at the White House.

Several Members of the Congress have introduced bills on this subject in both the present and previous Congresses. A subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture, headed by the able gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], whose long and constructive interest in watershed matters is known to everyone, worked out many problems which had to be resolved before this type of legislation was gotten into acceptable form.

On July 31, 1953, President Eisenhower sent to the Congress a message urging the enactment of this legislation and submitting a revised form of a bill as a substitute for bills previously introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], myself, and a number of other Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate. This new bill (H. R. 6788) was introduced in the Senate by Senator AIKEN, joined by several other Members of that body, and in the House by myself. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] introduced a bill with some slight changes from the form in which it was submitted by the President.

On February 2, 1954, the House Committee on Agriculture reported the bill H. R. 6788 and on March 11, 1954, the House of Representatives passed it by a unanimous vote in substantially the same form as it was introduced and reported by the committee. The bill passed the Senate on June 22 with a considerable number of amendments.

The conference report, which is presented herewith, represents a reconciliation of the differences between the House and the Senate bill. While I would have personally preferred the provisions of the House bill, I feel that the bill agreed upon in conference is an excellent measure and one which will function effectively in making possible a cooperative program between local agencies and the Federal Government in meeting the great problems of soil and water conservation and flood prevention which confront our country today.

Several of the amendments adopted by the Senate had the effect of slowing down the effective operation of the act.

The agreement reached in conference in practically every instance sets up a procedure to expedite consideration and approval of projects from the local level on up to the Department of Agriculture. It is my belief that this measure constitutes a landmark in our progress toward a better development and use of the great soil and water resources which are possessed by this country.

Taking into consideration the pilot plant projects contained in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1954, under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], and with the bill S. 3137 as amended in the House by the Lovre amendment, this Congress can truly be said to have enacted more legislation with reference to a more constructive use of our soil and water resources than any other Congress in history.

I desire at this time to thank all of the members of the committee on Agriculture for their contribution to this legislation because it is truly a committee bill. I also want to express my appreciation to the many Members of the House, who have contributed greatly to the progress and final enactment of this legislation.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, just a year ago tomorrow the House agreed to the conference report on the appropriation bill for agriculture for fiscal year 1954. That action marked the official beginning of the Hope-Andersen watershed protection program. Today, a year later, we are finishing action legislatively on this same program, placing the seal of approval by the Congress on this great conservation measure.

Little did I think more than a year ago that the Andersen-Hope watershed protection program would be received throughout the Nation as one of the greatest conservation programs ever enacted by the Congress. My subcommittee last year, through the urging of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] and myself, appropriated \$5 million as the first increment of a \$29 million program, under which 60 small pilot watershed programs are already in process of construction.

Mr. Speaker, I quote here in part from my speech on the House floor on July 23, 1953, page 9836 of the RECORD:

ANDERSEN-HOPE WATERSHED PROTECTION PROGRAM

This item would provide funds for a program of cooperation with local organizations on some 50 small watersheds in 27 States for the purpose of demonstrating the practicability of complete watershed protection as a means of conserving soil and water resources and alleviating damages from floods, siltation of reservoirs, impairment of stream channels, and related problems. These would be pilot plant watershed projects which could be completed in an average period of 5 years, at a total cost of about \$29 million to the Federal Government and

approximately an equal cost to the landowners, local organizations, and States. This would be a type of cost-sharing venture—a local-State-Federal partnership in the protection and improvement of our vital natural resources of soil and water.

SIZE OF WATERSHED

These demonstration watersheds range in size from as little as 12 square miles to as many as several hundred square miles. They are areas in which it is believed that local people and their local organizations, such as soil conservation districts, watershed districts, flood-control districts, etc., with appropriate help from State and Federal agencies, can complete the watershed treatment work needed in a relatively short period.

MEASURES TO BE INSTALLED

The watershed protection work would consist of application of soil and water conservation practices needed on the farm and ranch lands of the area, adequate protection and management of the woodland, and the installation of such measures as are needed and practicable for reduction of flood and sediment damages, such as small waterflow-retarding dams, channel improvements, stream bank stabilization, major gully control, and related measures.

The small watersheds were selected because they are areas in which the Soil Conservation Service and other agencies of the Department of Agriculture have made preliminary surveys mainly under the authority of the flood control acts which show the need and practicability of such watershed protection measures. It has been determined that in each of these watersheds the benefits of the program will exceed its costs.

AUTHORIZATION FOR PROGRAM

This type of work proposed is authorized by the Soil Conservation Act of 1935 which was passed in the 74th Congress without a dissenting vote in either House. This act is the basic legislation which established the Soil Conservation Service, an agency that now provides technical assistance to more than 2,500 local soil-conservation districts that are organized under State laws and now cover more than 80 percent of the agricultural lands of the Nation. The committee has been assured by both the Bureau of the Budget and the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture that the authority of this act is fully adequate to cover all of the types of improvements planned to be installed in these watersheds. As a matter of fact, it might be pointed out that the work carried out under this basic legislation for the first few years after its enactment was in the nature of demonstration projects directed toward the application of soil and water conservation practices on individual farms. For the past 10 years the Federal Government, through the Soil Conservation Service, has provided assistance to soil-conservation districts only to aid farmers and ranchers in planning and applying soil and water conservation practices on their own farms and ranches.

WORK ON BOTH PRIVATE AND PUBLIC LAND

Although the larger part of the work contemplated to be done under this estimate would be applied on agricultural lands in the small watersheds with assistance from the Soil Conservation Service, it is planned to install work also on headwater areas which fall within national forests or in non-Federal forest lands. The Forest Service will be allocated funds for this part of the work.

As a part of the program proposed under this appropriation, measurements will be made of the effectiveness of the improvements in reducing runoff and sedimentation and of the increased soil productivity resulting from the improvements. Also, these small watersheds will provide a means of working out practicable working relationships and procedures by which organized

local groups, in cooperation with State and Federal agencies, can carry out their planned programs of improvements within limited periods of time.

CHOICE OF WATERSHEDS

Although the available information indicates that the small watersheds included in the list that has been proposed are of high priority and constitute the best recommendation that could be made at the time, it was obviously not possible to foresee whether the local people in each of these watersheds would be in a position to carry through the program at the desired rate of progress. Local interests would be expected to provide all easements and rights-of-way for structural improvement, to carry out all of the land-treatment practices, and to meet certain other requirements adding up to about 50 percent of the total cost. If it is apparent that local interests in any of these areas are unable to go this far at this time, alternate watersheds will be selected with the approval of the committees of the Congress.

Let me make this plain: We are not trying to take away any authority whatsoever regarding flood control from the Public Works Committee. So we state in our report:

Before embarking on a comprehensive large-scale program of this nature, the conferees are of the opinion that the appropriate legislative committees of the Congress should give attention to legislation in this field which will provide a measure of local cooperation on future projects, and fix proper standards for cooperation with the Soil Conservation Service by local participation and beneficiaries of the program.

Experience in dealing with conservation projects authorized in flood-prevention and flood-control laws demonstrates that these laws are too cumbersome to apply to smaller watershed areas.

Mr. Speaker, may I express my appreciation to the Committee on Agriculture, to Mr. HOPE, to Mr. AUGUST H. ANDERSEN, to Mr. COOLEY, and the others for their splendid work in making permanent the Andersen-Hope watershed protection program. Soil Conservation Service can now do a complete job of keeping good, black topsoil from going down into rivers below. Floods start at the hilltop. This great program, nationwide in scope, will result in splendid returns.

These returns—

As the St. Paul Farmer says on July 17—

will be represented by water for irrigation, soil that stays in place, higher crop yields and fewer machinery breakdowns. Down stream, farmers and city dwellers will get more flood protection, less silting of rivers and waterways, and better improvements. Rain will remain where it falls on the hilltop.

REPORT ON H. R. 9909

Mr. CRETILLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service have until midnight tomorrow to file a report on the bill H. R. 9909.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON S. 2665

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Ser-

vice have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill S. 2665.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MACHROWICZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

AMENDING ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1946, AS AMENDED

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 630 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9757) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use and yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of House Resolution 630, which will make in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 9757, to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes.

House Resolution 630 provides for an open rule with 4 hours of general debate on the bill itself.

H. R. 9757 seeks to bring up to date the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 in order that the act may keep step with atomic progress itself. It is hoped that by this legislation the necessary legislative controls over atomic energy will bear a reasonable but safe relationship to the realities of the scientific, technical, economic, and political changes that have evolved during the last few years.

Mr. Speaker, the report on this bill brought out the fact that when the original Atomic Energy Act was written in the 79th Congress, the United States possessed a monopoly in the field of atomic weapons. This situation no longer exists. In addition to this change

in the atomic energy situation during these past years, there exists the fact that useful peacetime development and use of atomic power is now at hand. This situation was not anticipated a few years ago for it was thought at that time that it would be many years before atomic energy could be turned to commercial use.

H. R. 9757, Mr. Speaker, would authorize the negotiation of bilateral agreements for cooperation with foreign nations in the area of peacetime uses of atomic energy under carefully stipulated safeguards.

The Atomic Energy Commission would be empowered to transfer and exchange restricted data dealing with industrial, nonmilitary use of atomic energy. In addition to this if the proper precautionary measures are taken, the Commission may transfer to another nation atomic materials needed for the development or utilization of atomic energy for nonmilitary and research purposes.

On the military side, the legislation would permit the Department of Defense, under full security safeguards to transfer to another nation, or to a regional defense organization of which we are a member, restricted data concerning the tactical employment of atomic weapons. The type of information that could be given to friendly nations would include data necessary to the development of defense plans, the training of personnel in the employment of and defense against atomic weapons, and the evaluation of the capabilities of potential enemies in the employment of atomic weapons. The information could not include any data which would reveal important information on the design or fabrication of the nuclear portions of atomic weapons.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 9757 would amend the Atomic Energy Act so that it would permit the Atomic Energy Commission, on the basis of established criteria, to relate the scope of background investigation required to the extent and sensitivity of the classified information to which an employee would have access while on the project. This bill would also give the Department of Defense a voice with the Atomic Energy Commission in the declassification proceedings involving restricted data, which relates primarily to military utilization of atomic weapons.

The third big change in the new bill involves the proposed permitting of the Atomic Energy Commission to license private industry, to possess and use special nuclear materials. The United States Government, however, would retain title to such materials. The report on this bill, Mr. Speaker, stressed the belief of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that increased private participation in atomic power development, if properly controlled and handled, will accelerate the progress toward the day when widespread use of atomic power for economic uses will become a reality.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a highly technical one and I have very briefly outlined some of the more important provisions that are in it. However, I think that there is no need to impress upon the Members of the House the necessity for

achieving a nice balance between protecting the security of our country through husbanding our knowledge of atomic matters, and helping our allies to be prepared and informed on the subject if an emergency ever should arise. This bill also considers the very real possibility of using atomic power for the betterment of mankind in various peacetime projects and makes it possible for our country to start out on the avenue of developing this tremendous power for constructive and worthwhile purposes. I hope that the House will adopt the rule on this extremely important bill and that the bill itself will merit the favorable action of the House.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise at this time to oppose the rule on this bill. I am in favor of the rule. It is an open one and, of course, that is the type of a rule under which a problem of this great significance should be considered by the House.

It is frequently said by sponsors of other bills that are before the House that this is an important bill. I say with as much objectivity as I can, being a member of this committee and having served on it since its inception, that this is probably the most important bill that we will consider during this session of the Congress.

Why do I say that? Because we are approaching a new era, the atomic era for peacetime use, and this bill seeks to make possible the application of the peacetime benefits of the atom to the people of America and, of course, to the people of the world. In moving from a total, or almost a total military use to a peacetime use, we have tremendous problems because every reactor that is built to produce the substance which makes the atomic bomb and triggers the hydrogen bomb is the same substance that will be used in the reactors that will produce the kilowatts for peacetime use.

It has been estimated by the scientists who know a great deal about this matter, and by the technicians, that within 15 to 20 years' time 30 to 35 percent of the total electricity used in the United States will come from atomic fission reactors. If this be true, then we can see what a tremendous subject we are dealing with in this bill, because if we bring this new potential source to the people—that is, the third source, and I speak of the first source as being the fossil fuel, the coal, oil, and gas source, the second source the hydroelectric production of electricity, and the third source the fission of the atom—so that the people may have the benefit of this source, so that it will not be restricted by exclusive patent rights, so that restrictive licensing procedures, so that all of the other administrative obstructions and destructive possibilities can be guarded against, then, indeed, the people will have the right to use this source.

Now, this third great source must be brought to the people and brought to them in such a way that they have access to it, unrestrained access to it, and these are some of the subjects that are contained in this bill.

I will say at this time that the public power versus private power fight that has been brought about by sections of this bill rests in no part upon the gentleman from California, who is now addressing the House. I tried to keep these sections out of the bill. I tried to keep the Atomic Energy Commission dedicated to the job which we gave the Atomic Energy Commission to do, and that was to make fissionable substances to defend America and the free world. The injection of this subject into the bill came from other persons and it came after I warned them that if they did put this subject into the bill, they would stir up a hornet's nest, because it would bring in all the age-old controversy which is inherent in the subject of public versus private power.

Now, this is not a matter of controversy in my district. In my district we have the power from the great Hoover Dam. We have had it for some 20 years, and it is used both by municipalities and by private power companies. Part of my district is served by the great Los Angeles Light & Power system and part of it is served by the private utility companies, and there is no controversy there. So, it is nothing of immediate personal importance to me, I want to say, but nevertheless it has been put into the bill, and once having been put into the bill then it has to be considered.

The Dixon-Yates controversy is something apart from the great importance of this bill, but it is something that is in the bill and it has to be, of course, discussed. There are other things in the bill that are a great deal more important.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. I am very curious and very anxious to have the gentleman indicate to me what part of the bill the gentleman has in mind when he says the Commission is put into the power business.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The Commission is put into the power business by the licensing provisions in the bill, provisions 182 to 186, where the Commission is given the power to license private utilities and others to go into the power business. Then there is other language in the bill which in effect restricts the Atomic Energy Commission from doing those things which it is empowered to license others to do, and that is where I say that the power question is put into the bill.

There are other sections in the bill which are equally important and more important, possibly, than that. Certainly the subject of the international arrangement, international agreements, treaties, and cooperation is at this time one of the most important things with which we have to deal when the peace of the world is at stake and when atomic fission or hydrogen fusion can destroy cities the size of New York, and when we are dealing with that kind of power, certainly the international sections are equally important.

I do not have time at this time, but I will discuss later the international sections of this bill, which, in my humble

opinion, are not designed to assist the President of the United States to make international arrangements and international agreements with other nations of the world. It is not designed to bring about the fruition of the international atomic pool which the President spoke to the General Assembly about with such great eloquence back in December. But, the language that is contained in these sections rather than untying the President's hands and freeing him to do these things, ties the President's hands behind his back and impresses these negotiations with foreign nations into a rigid mold, a mold in which, by peculiar coincidence, even the Atomic Energy Commission has the right to veto the President in one instance. The Department of Defense, of course, is also asked to give their approval, but the Department of Defense can be ordered by the President to give their approval, and if the Atomic Energy Commission is an independent agency—and I confidently believe that it is—it cannot be ordered by the President to approve an international arrangement which the President might make. Yet, there is a section in the bill which calls upon the Atomic Energy Commission to approve the President's international agreement for cooperation.

Then there is the subject of patents in the bill. The President in his message to the Congress on February 17 said in effect that there should be a period of time intervene between the licensing of private individuals to participate in this industry and the time when patent rights could obtain. He said that he thought for a long time, and he hoped that that time would not be over 5 years, that compulsory licensing of patents should obtain. There was no such section in the Cole-Hickenlooper bill as it was first introduced. But in the committee a section on compulsory licensing was put into the bill. It is a matter of great concern to some of us that this language does not carry out as strongly as it should the President's admonition for everyone to have access to the patents that are developed during the next 5 years; because he realized that certain great corporations have had an advantage in participating in this program. He knew they had an advantage in know-how, in the techniques, in the processes, in the formulas, in the matter of mechanical devices. He knew that if those limited corporations that had participated in the development of the atomic energy program were allowed the privilege, the advantage, of filing on patents, that they could file on patents which would give them the right to exclude all of American industry unless they paid through the nose in the form of royalties. That would not spread throughout industry the right of participation but it would limit to a great degree the right of participation. That is why the President said that we should have a compulsory licensing section. That section has been put in the bill. I intend at the proper time to offer amendments which will strengthen the patenting provision so that no corporation which has participated in this industry under Government contract, paid for by Gov-

ernment funds, shall have the right to obtain advantageous patent rights over areas of equity and participation in this project; so that for the next 5 years these patents shall be open to all.

I have no objection to those who get these patents obtaining reasonable compensation, but I do object to their having the right to exclude others from participation in this great new art, this great new technique upon which the world is looking, not only for preserving the peace of the world but for bringing untold peacetime blessings of atomic energy to all the peoples of the world.

There are other sections here which need comment. I know our time is limited. But as the debate goes on, some of these points will be explained to the Members of the House. I hope that the amendments which will be offered by other Members and by myself to attain these ends will be given fair consideration. I know they will by this House; and, of course, like all other Members of the House, I am willing to abide by the results.

We know that this subject has been debated in the Senate for 7 days now. The Senate sat all night; they debated all of last night on this subject. This is an indication of what the Senate of the United States thinks of the importance of this bill.

We are being called upon to debate the bill for 4 hours and discharge our responsibilities. And I say that it is a great responsibility that each and every one of us has under this bill and that the time is far, far too short really to explain the bill.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. I wanted to make sure that the gentleman did not leave an impression which I feel he did not intend to leave when he indicated that the other body had devoted so much time to this subject and then alluded to the fact that the House was allowed only 4 hours for discussion. I am sure the gentleman did not intend to be critical of the provision made by the Committee on Rules, or of the rule for the discussion of this subject.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will answer my chairman in this way. If I have any time left and I hope the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] will be lenient with me—I want to say that I am not criticizing the chairman of our committee nor am I criticizing the Committee on Rules. I just mentioned the fact about debate being limited to 4 hours.

Mr. COLE of New York. I want to make certain if it is not true that the gentleman from California collaborated with me and the gentleman from North Carolina with respect to the request to the Rules Committee for 4 hours for consideration of this subject.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I did, and I want the House to know that I agreed on 4 hours. I think it is a short time for this important bill but I am not being critical of it. I realize we are in the last days of the session and that we must save our time. So it was not with an attitude of criticism that I made that comment.

Mr. COLE of New York. I was sure that was the case, but I was afraid it left a false impression.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. May I say that I have never worked on a committee with a chairman who was fairer than the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]. He has been more than fair during the hearings and during all the committee considerations. I want to compliment him on the long and arduous work he did with other members of the committee to bring this bill to the floor. Nothing that I say is critical of the gentleman from New York.

I also want to compliment the members of the staff. We have had a marvelous staff. They have worked into the wee, small hours of the night, they have worked without any reservation as to time and with complete loyalty. They have shown no partisanship in the consideration of this measure and in helping both sides of the committee. I want to pay my tribute to them in closing my remarks. We are fortunate in having an excellent staff, many of whom are specialists in the various fields of physics, law, source materials, military weapons, reactor techniques, and other important fields of interest and jurisdiction of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. All of them have contributed greatly to the production of this legislation.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry from the gentleman from New York, the gentleman from California outlined some of the things in this bill that related to power, but more far-reaching are the things that are not in this bill that relate to power and relate to the future of power development, the development of electric energy in the United States.

We are standing here at the threshold of the development of atomic power, the creation of electric energy by means of a new process. As was suggested by the gentleman from California, we have heretofore had two major means of developing electric energy—coal, gas, and the other natural fuels, and hydroelectric power. Today with respect to the development of atomic energy we stand just where we stood 50 years ago when we started to develop electric energy by means of falling waters.

We must take advantage of the experience and the background the Federal Power Commission has gained in those 50 years. In 50 years we have learned that in order to protect the public interest in this great natural resource of hydroelectric energy we have to have certain basic protections. The Federal Power Act and other acts such as the Rivers and Harbors Act, the Reclamation Act, acts relating to projects out in my country, the Bonneville Power Authority and the Fort Peck Dam, all provided for those protections for the public interest. They all provided a preference clause for the distribution of power generated by hydroelectric dams. They provided a Federal power yardstick, so that we had a means of determining fair

rates for supplying power by private utilities to the consumers.

Out in the Pacific Northwest, we have learned to get along with the private utilities. We have the Bonneville Power Authority, which markets power for the Federal Government, and we have the Washington Water Power Co., the Idaho Power Co., the Washington Power & Light Co., and the Montana Power Co., and others, all private utilities who contribute to that Northwest power pool and are able to market their own power. We have benefited in the Northwest by having private power companies and the Federal power authority develop in parallel fashion. We have found it is necessary in order to protect the cheap power we have out there in the Northwest, to have a yardstick by means of which we can ascertain and determine what a fair and equitable rate for the payment to private utilities is going to be. We have determined that the Federal Government has a responsibility—a responsibility to the cooperatives, to the municipalities and to the public utility districts who want to transmit or distribute their own power as a nonprofit cooperative enterprise. Many of those municipalities and many of those public agencies are not large enough to be able to generate their own power economically so they have to turn to the Federal Government in order to find a central power station. This Federal central power station will supply power for them at a fair rate. For that reason, since 1908 we have put in various public acts a preference clause saying that these people who have the right to choose and who have the right to determine that they will distribute their own power will have a place to go to purchase power. We have found in various acts I have mentioned such as the rivers and harbors and reclamation acts and such acts as the Boulder Dam Act that is necessary in order to protect those people that we have a preference clause which declares that public agencies, municipalities, and REA co-ops will have a prior right to purchase power that is generated by the Federal Government. Now we are embarking upon a new program of the generation of power. We are confronted with atomic reactors which may, as has been predicted here, develop in a few years 25 to 30 percent of the power of this country. The Federal Government in order to carry out its responsibility to the public must, just as in the case of hydroelectric development, protect these consumers. Therefore the present customers who enjoy a prior right to purchase federally hydro-generated power must be given the same right in the purchase of atomic-generated power.

A preference clause must be written into this bill that will empower the Federal Government to generate, transmit, and distribute atomically created electrical energy and that will preserve the right of municipalities, public-utility districts, States, rural electrification cooperatives, and other public agencies to exercise a prior right for the transmission and distribution of such power.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be considerable interest in my section of the country from the rural electric cooperatives. They have been sending me wires expressing their opinions and expressing some concern about this bill. I only take this time to express the hope that in general debate, Members on both sides of the aisle, who have this bill under discussion, can clear up that point. I do not know whether they are objecting to something that is in the bill or something that is not in the bill. I wish they could clear that up from the standpoint of rural electric cooperatives.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING].

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, it is with humility that I rise to speak on this matter. I have great respect for the members of the joint committee which reported out this bill. But I feel that this bill amending the Atomic Energy Act is the most important measure on which it has been my responsibility to vote since becoming a Member of the United States Congress. I read the report with care. I noted that the first sentence of the report says:

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to whom was referred the bill, H. R. 9757, to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes, having considered the same, unanimously report favorably thereon and recommend that the bill do pass.

Then as I read the rest of the report, I discovered that while there was unanimity in reporting the bill out that was where unanimity seemed to end. There was in fact very substantial dissent, particularly on the part of those who, as I understand it, were among those most often present at the hearings during the consideration of the bill.

There is, for example, dissent on the part of the distinguished chairman of the committee, joined by another member, with regard to the patent provisions. There is dissent on the part of a Member of the other body with regard to the international section and he is joined in that dissent by two of the Members of the House. Finally, there is extended dissent by two Members of the House of Representatives.

I am entirely serious when I say that I consider this to be the most important piece of legislation on which I have been called to vote. I think that this is a fundamental question involving the \$12 billion of the people's money which has been expended in the development of this great new force.

The question which rises in my mind is not so much whether this provision is perfect or that provision entirely in the public interest but whether it is wise for the Congress of the United States in the closing days of a session, in the hectic, some might even say somewhat hysterical, time of the last few days of a congressional session to rewrite almost in its entirety the basic act which was passed by the Congress in 1946.

I reiterate that I have the deepest respect for the members of this committee whether they be Members of the House or of the other body, Republicans, or Democrats; but I cannot fail to state my own fear that we may well make a serious mistake by going even beyond what the President recommended and by passing this legislation hastily.

The decision we take in the next few days may be irrevocable. It seems to me imperative that on this issue of all issues we examine not only our hearts and minds but also our souls.

This is a fundamental issue of our time.

Our decision on this matter may well alter the course of history.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], a distinguished member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the bill is considered in the Committee of the Whole I may include extraneous items and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I hope the gentleman will make the announcement that if the hearings are to be available to the House each Member must bring the hearings that was mailed to his office, in view of the fact that there will not be a supply, I am told by the staff, of the hearings available. So if any Member wants to refer to them he will have to bring his own copy.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak this afternoon on this measure, but since there have been, in my opinion, somewhat confused statements made about this legislation over the past few weeks, I feel it my duty as best I can to call to the attention of this body the importance of this measure which is before us at the present time.

Our committee, which brought this measure to the floor of the House is, as you know, composed of 9 Members of the House, and 9 Members of the Senate. Up to this time it has been a committee which has not acted in a partisan way at all, or on a political basis. I believe every Member will bear me out that that is true.

Today we are faced with a far more important thing in this bill than what has been taking all of the time for the past week in the other body, in my opinion. I hope that every Member of this body will read the five principles of international relationship that the President laid down a few weeks ago. Whether we are Republicans or Democrats, at this hour in the period of our history we owe allegiance, I think, to

those things that go far deeper than some little issue that involves a little matter here at home. He said:

First. No people on earth can be held as a people to be an enemy, for all humanity shares the common hunger for peace and fellowship and justice.

Second. No nation's security and well being can be lastingly achieved in isolation, but only in effective cooperation with fellow-nations.

There is a big part in this bill that bears on that point.

He said:

Third. Any nation's right to a form of government and an economic system of its own choosing is inalienable.

Fourth. Any nation's attempt to dictate to other nations their form of government is indefensible.

Fifth. A nation's hope of lasting peace cannot be firmly based upon any race in armaments, but rather upon just relations and honest understanding with all other nations.

There is a big part of this bill that bears on that very point.

President Eisenhower next presented his point 6. It was a proposal for world cooperation to promote peace and progress in all countries, as follows:

This Government is ready to ask its people to join with all nations in devoting a substantial percentage of any savings achieved by real disarmament to a fund for world aid and reconstruction. The purposes of this great work would be: To help other peoples to develop the undeveloped areas of the world to stimulate profitable and fair world trade, to assist all peoples to know the blessings of productive freedom.

The monuments of this new kind of war would be these: Roads and schools, hospitals and homes, food and health. We are ready, in short, to dedicate our strength to serving the needs, rather than the fears, of the world.

This bill has a large part in carrying out that program.

There are two important things in this measure, in my opinion, when we talk about whether or not this bill should be considered. I may say to the gentleman who just preceded me that a letter was written, when I was chairman of the committee, 2 years ago this July, to the Commission asking for a report, provided for under present law, known as section 7B report. That letter is a matter of record. This committee has been continuously considering this measure since that time.

When we first wrote this measure we wrote it on a theoretical basis. We did not have anything at all to hang our hats on except what we inherited from the War Department; therefore I think it is important to the Nation, it is important to the world, that we at this time look at the act, after spending some \$12 billion, and try to see what we can do with it for humanity.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, those are the points I would like to call the Members' attention to. Let us forget all of these side issues that may be brought in. I do not agree with them all. I think some should not be in this bill. I do not agree with them, but they are

here and they have been made an issue. Let us rise to a point above this little petty partisanship, and not talk about whether we are going to build a spite fence in somebody's backyard. I do not like that.

The situation that calls for our attention is whether we are going to cooperate with our allies in trying to work out some means in case of attack which today would result in a state of confusion unless we do something about it. The other matter is trying to cooperate with the world. This is no giveaway program as has been charged. That simply does not exist in this bill. When you get down to studying this measure you will find it is not a giveaway program. Every ounce of the fissionable material that is held, whether we loan it to some college in New York or some college in my own State, which we have done, or whether we loan it to our allies, is still retained in our right and ownership and we can pull it out and use it any time we want to. The only thing that is involved is probably some engineering skill which, in my opinion, most of the countries have and it is well known at the present time. It is just assistance to try to get some of our allies back on their feet, and in my opinion it will cost very little compared with what we have been spending in cash. Now, I hope that on tomorrow when the debate is on that we will not forget the main issues in the bill, because I feel it is highly important that this measure be enacted at this session of the Congress.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPEASEMENT UNLIMITED

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, not so many years ago, the people of the world heard the cry "Peace in our time." This was the cry of Neville Chamberlain, the British participant in the infamous Munich sellout of central Europe when he arrived at London Airport following that conference. We all know that the Munich conference was the opening act in a series of inevitable events leading up to World War II. It was not long after the Munich Conference that Hitler's appetite for conquest and aggression took the German people into an all-out invasion of Poland. This aggression set off World War II.

Today we are hearing the cry of "Peace in our time at any price." This was the guiding slogan of the French and British at the recently concluded Geneva Conference. We all know that the Geneva Conference resulted in a complete sellout of all that is dear to all liberty-loving people in the free world and those many millions who yearn for

freedom who are now held captive within the Red colonial empire. The results of the Geneva Conference are far more grave than the consequences of the infamous Munich Conference. The strategic importance of Indochina to the security and freedom of all of free Asia is well known to the Members of this House. We all know, for example, that Japan has historically depended upon the rice stocks which come from that area of Indochina which has now been handed over to the Communists. This means that free Japan will be compelled willy-nilly to do business with the Communists in Viet Minh. But perhaps more important than that is the blow this will strike at the hope of the millions of people behind the Iron Curtain who have been anxiously awaiting the defeat of Communist aggression by the West. The results of the Geneva Conference can bring them only a message of despair because the West has failed miserably to stop Communist aggression.

The United States cannot escape responsibility for the sellout at Geneva. Secretary Dulles was correct when he withdrew from the Geneva Conference, recognizing the sellout that was then in the making. The unfortunate return of Under Secretary Smith who, from the statements he made in Geneva, made it clear that he did not personally relish the task that was laid upon him, nevertheless makes us a party to the defeat and sellout at Geneva.

Yesterday there appeared in the Washington Star a column by Constantine Brown which puts into perspective the real issues at Geneva and the penalties the free world will pay for the failure of its leading statesmen to stand up against Communist aggression. Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the column of Constantine Brown:

SOLD INTO COMMUNIST SLAVERY—GENEVA TUG OF WAR IS REGARDED ONLY AS A VICTORY FOR REDS AT EXPENSE OF 20 MILLION INDO-CHINESE

(By Constantine Brown)

The gigantic tug of war played at Geneva has ended in a complete victory for the Reds. The rights of some 20 million people who wanted to live free—free of Communist domination and French colonialism—have been trampled under foot by the great powers.

The cries for justice by the representatives of the Vietnam were drowned by the advocates of peace in our time at any price, and by the Reds, who were holding them up at pistol point. The policeman of the world, the United Nations, was strangely silent. The appeals of the Indochina people for U. N. control at least of the so-called armistice terms were scornfully rejected by the very founders and charter members of that peace-loving organization.

One of the Soviet members is reported to have said at Geneva:

"This is a he-man's job; not one for an old woman."

Ever since the parley opened last April, the Communists have never yielded an inch. While the western representatives were running in circles, smiling, courting, and kowtowing to the new diplomatic star, Peiping's Foreign Minister, Chou En-lai, his Soviet colleague and mentor, Molotov, has maintained a stern attitude.

The "after you Gaston" act of Bidault (and later Mendes-France) and Eden was

accepted literally by the Communists. They did take precedence at all the functions held at the conference.

Judging from what has been released, so far, in connection with the armistice terms, Geneva will go down in history as a diplomatic catastrophe worse than Munich. It also may have more far-reaching consequences.

The fighting in Indochina is about to end, and so are the hopes for freedom of its 20 million people.

The deal was made across the diplomatic table by nations which claim to be defenders of freedom.

They sold their one-time wards to the ruthless Communist dictatorship. They provided Communist China with complete control over the Breadbasket of Asia, and also with strategic points in the South Pacific, from where they can eventually wage war against the remaining free nations, including the United States, with greater expectations of success.

The strategic importance of Indochina is so considerable to us that when the Japanese early in 1941 began to move toward that country, Secretary of State Cordell Hull sent a stern note of warning to Tokyo.

Today, the peninsula has more importance than in the past. Japan, which we are now striving to keep on our side, depends to a large extent for her food on rice imports from Indochina.

France and Great Britain, with our approval, have handed the richest portion of Vietnam to the Communists. It won't be long before Peiping tells the Japanese to give up their association with the United States or else they will suffer unbearable economic consequences.

What puzzles many American observers is the reason which prompted sending such a high-ranking diplomat as Undersecretary of State Walter Bedell Smith back to Geneva. Mr. Dulles had followed a healthy instinct when he quit the Conference, and ordered, shortly after his departure, his deputy to come home, too.

He rushed back to Paris for 2 weeks at the pressing request of the French and British to talk over apparently, the creation of a South Pacific pact for the purpose of preventing any further Communist advances in the south.

The terms of the armistice leave no doubt, however, in anybody's mind that the whole of Indochina is doomed.

According to Geneva reports, neither southern Vietnam nor Laos and Cambodia will be permitted to join any coalitions such as Mr. Dulles had in mind. Yet, despite the warnings at Geneva by lesser American officials that France and Britain were determined to sign an appeasement contract, Mr. Dulles last Friday ordered Undersecretary Smith back to the "Swiss Munich." His presence is bound to be viewed by free Asiatics as a tacit American endorsement of the sellout of Indochina to the Communists.

The Secretary of State explained to some friends in Congress that this "gesture" of sending General Smith was necessary to patch up our difficulties with France and Great Britain. Mr. Dulles could not refuse the pressing demands of our allies without threatening allied unity.

Congressional leaders of both parties, who are so bitterly opposed to our surrender on the Far East, question however, the wisdom of Americans condoning the selling of another large batch of free peoples into Communist slavery.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I had for today be va-

cated and that the time may be transferred to tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DISABLED VETERANS AND SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS AND DEPENDENTS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am profoundly disappointed that section 3 of this bill as adopted and reported by the Committee has been for some quite unexplainable reason lifted out of the bill before us. I would not seek to divine or impugn the motives of those responsible for this strange and deplorable action.

If so-called economy was the aim—economy based on penurious treatment of the gallant veterans who bled for this Nation, their widows, their orphans, their helpless dependents, those brave veterans of the Spanish-American War and their dependents along with the others because they are just as much entitled, it is something entirely beyond my comprehension.

Penury at the expense of the wounded, the battle-scarred, the war-tattered, the shell-shocked, the mentally afflicted, the poor helpless widows and orphans, those inarticulate ones unable to plead for or help themselves, is particularly regrettable, in fact, it gives me feelings of shame for the Government willingly to turn its back upon those to whom it owes the most.

Do you remember Churchill's great words, "Never have so many owed so much to so few"? Well, it is applicable here as well as to the brave English lads of whom they were first uttered. We, too, are indebted to our war heroes. We owe them a debt we could never possibly pay, but instead we are paying them off in soft talk about economy and mere meager pittance.

Economy is the watchword of this bill. Economy for whom and for what? Economy of intelligence and prudence and stability? Economy of measure and calculation and fairness? No, indeed. This is an economy of moral obliquity and ethical astigmatism and no one can make anything else out of it. Think of it, the great Nation that has poured out a steady, lavish stream of gold and treasure of more than \$100 billion to help foreign nations grudgingly paying more than a paltry mite to the very ones who saved the Republic with their limbs, their sight, and their blood, and their suffering loved ones and orphans. If I must confess an absorbing astigmatism of my own in not being able to comprehend this great paradox, then I hope I may be pardoned and understood.

Because are we now living in the age of the paradox—the moral and economic paradox—hospitals for the rest of the world, none for America, full armaments

for NATO, limitations upon our own naval vessel and aircraft construction, with American funds for foreign nations, stagnation and unemployment in Charlestown and Quincy, Mass., and other places in our land where these implements are made?

So much for statements of generality somewhat pertinent to the paradox of veterans' legislation facing the House today. There is a ray of light. There is some small benefit to the disabled and their loved ones. The relief provided is meager, indeed, and it is not extended to cover all those it should cover. It is not enough to meet current conditions and costs. But it is something—a half loaf is better than none, and it is in that belief, not satisfied at all with the negligently degree of help that I will support this measure.

I wonder when we will come to a fitting realization of basic ethical values evidencing our gratitude and the Nation's gratitude to veterans. And I wonder especially that when war comes again with what enthusiasm or otherwise young men will rally to the dread, but urgent, all-significant call that will determine whether freedom lives or not, who see before them today our indifference and picayune treatment of veterans of our previous wars and their dependents.

Much of the great sums we have spent for veterans has been used wisely and well. A great deal more has been poorly administered. But the real pity is that in time of gigantic generosity to others in foreign lands we have done and are doing so relatively little for our own country and our own disabled veterans and those dearest to them.

POSTAL FIELD SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry that this important measure comes to the House in this way and in this form. I cannot possibly subscribe to it as it is presently constituted. It is not my purpose to question the legislative policy and strategy behind this measure except to state that I heartily disapprove of the failure to accord Members of the House an opportunity to be recorded on the separate, distinct provisions of this bill.

Various reasons are assigned to account for this single-package measure embracing not only postal-pay raises but rate increases and reclassification features as well. Primarily it is asserted that funds must be provided by the House to pay for the pay raises. I would normally have no quarrel with such fiscal procedure if it were logically and impartially pursued. But of course it never is and probably never could be. I noticed that the foreign-aid bills, NATO, European defense, mutual security, and other such measures never carry such requirements. The Congress manages to

find plenty of money to meet these multi-billion-dollar authorizations. In fact, now that the matter of fiscal balance and the principle of pay as you go has been stressed here as a basis for legislation, I might suggest that the Congress vote generous pay raises over and above the rates of the pending bill for postal and generally classified Government workers and then pay the cost of such well-merited increases by deducting necessary funds from foreign military and economic relief measures. In the light of Geneva, Indochina, and other recent changes in the world picture and the shift of our so-called allies toward Soviet orientation, we would be not only justified but very wise to restrict further foreign expenditures until we know where we stand. That would be reappraisal and a realistic approach to some solution of our present very pathetic international plight.

Be that as it may, I favor adequate pay for postal and Government workers to bring their wages and salaries up to the decent levels and standards of comparable positions in private industry. I am prepared to vote in favor of such increases on a generous and fairminded basis.

I am opposed to postal-rate increases at this time as proposed by the bill. I do not desire to argue this question at length. In brief, I believe that the present rates, particularly those on first-class mail, are high enough. To increase them further, having in mind that the post office is a public service devoted to the public welfare in so many respects, would be an imposition upon business, the press, and the general public which I deem unnecessary and highly undesirable.

To tie postal-rate increases to meritorious and richly deserved pay raises for postal workers is an injustice, an anachronism, and an economic fallacy. If such a principle is adopted, what sources can be tapped to pay for raises for other Government employees whose departments are not revenue producing. Obviously the only answer is that as to all pay bills as well as other activities of the Federal Government we must look to the general revenues of the Government.

Let me state that I have high and special regard, esteem, and pride for and toward our faithful postal workers. They have difficult jobs requiring high standards of diligence, steadiness, reliability, and ability. Their contributions to the Nation are very great and would be difficult entirely to measure. The record clearly shows that there is a serious, substantial lag in their pay scales which in my judgment should now be corrected.

This can be done only by enacting the original Corbett bill, or some similar measure. I hope the leadership will promptly bring this or some other suitable bill to the floor so that this House can do what it overwhelmingly wants to do, namely, extend just, generous consideration to the postal workers and soon thereafter to all Government workers as well.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to state that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has been flooded with regrets and protests because the money for the so-called non-service-connected cases and for the Spanish-American War widows was stricken from the bill H. R. 9020 yesterday. Judge MACK introduced a bill to take care of those cases, and I believe firmly that the House and the Senate in their wisdom will pass that bill and the President will sign it before we adjourn. I do not think the Members realize that those people are so dependent on this money which was given to them by law, and certainly if we can increase everybody else, all of the Government employees, we should give those people, who are very seriously disabled, the same consideration.

RE ADMISSION OF CERTAIN CZECH-OSLOVAK AND HUNGARIAN CHURCHMEN AS DELEGATES TO WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES CONFERENCE

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, in its press release No. 390 of July 17, the Department of State has stated that Secretary Dulles has recommended to the Attorney General that 11 churchmen from Communist Czechoslovakia and Communist Hungary be admitted as delegates to the second assembly of the World Council of Churches which is scheduled to meet at Evanston, Ill., the last 2 weeks of next month. There are other Protestant Church conferences at Princeton University and at Chicago this summer which these individuals may be expected to attend.

The Department admits that some or all of these delegates may have found it possible to reconcile their faith with public support of communism. The Department feels, however, that all invited delegates who are admissible under the law should be permitted to attend these meetings since their conduct will reveal whether they come as churchmen or as propagandists of an aggressive and materialistic philosophy fundamentally hostile to religious faith. The Department also expresses the hope that the meetings may have a beneficial effect upon these delegates and perhaps act to lend a spiritual strengthening of the Czechoslovak and Hungarian churches in the face of Communist pressure.

Mr. Speaker, I have discussed this problem with high officials of the State

Department as well as with certain prominent churchmen, members of the National Council of Churches of Christ in this country. I have attempted to carry on these discussions in a friendly, constructive manner but I have been firm in my expressed belief that the admission of these people would be a tragic catastrophe and would do incalculable harm to the best interests of this country and indeed of the entire free world.

I am assuming that these aliens would be mandatorily excludable from this country under the provisions of section 212 (a) (28) of Public Law 414, otherwise known as the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, and that they are being temporarily admitted in the discretion of the Attorney General under the provisions of section 212 (d) (3) of the same legislation.

I am not believing that these aliens would present any risk to the national security of this country from the standpoint of either espionage or sabotage—they are, I am sure, coming simply as propagandists for their cause. Neither am I concerned primarily over their possible influence upon the people of this country or upon the majority of delegates from other free countries of the world. What does cause me grave anxiety, Mr. Speaker, is the effect this will have upon the peoples now living in Communist slavery, especially in the countries of Czechoslovakia and Hungary, peoples whose liberation we have officially pledged ourselves to anticipate and hope for. I fear the shock to these people and to the cause of anticommunism everywhere behind the Iron Curtain will be tremendous.

In 1950 a religious conference was held at Luhacovice in Czechoslovakia which was attended by alleged representatives of many faiths from both East and West Europe. Among those in attendance, it should be noted, was Dr. Hewlett Johnson, the notorious Dean of Canterbury. Also present and taking a prominent part in the proceedings were Bishop Josef Hromadka and Dr. Viktor Hajek of Czechoslovakia and Bishop Albert Bereczky of Hungary, all of whom are among the delegates expected at Evanston next month. This conference adopted a unanimous resolution from which I would like to quote a few brief excerpts:

We condemn with all the strength at our disposal the ungodly plans of the Western Powers, who in their futile attempts to prevent the victorious ascent of Socialist ideas want to plunge mankind into a new war catastrophe. These enemies of the peace of mankind, in the hope of lengthening the life of their immoral exploitive system, have resorted to the loathsome method of frightening the peace-loving peoples with the atom bomb. . . . We are Christians, preachers of Christ's teachings of love and peace and therefore we are for peace. This is why we are proud to declare ourselves part of the great peace camp, led by the Soviet Union. . . . We are confident that we will best serve the cause of peace if, in accord with the will of God, we devote all our priestly endeavors to helping our working people to build up socialism, the victory of which is also a guaranty of lasting peace among nations.

I might add that literature containing a comprehensive report of this Luhacovice Conference, including the text of the resolution from which I have quoted above, this literature has been circulated in this country by the Communist Czechoslovak Embassy here in Washington, which should clearly show the close ties between the Communist Government in that country and the so-called church delegates who are coming to the United States shortly from Czechoslovakia.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that individuals who have subscribed to statements such as these can make any contribution to the church conferences in question.

I am not acquainted with the backgrounds of the other Czech and Slovak delegates, Bishop Chabada, Bishop Varga, Mr. Ziak, and Dr. Michalko. I do know something, however, of the Hungarians who are, in addition to Bishop Bereczky, Bishop Dezser, Bishop Veto, Bishop Peter, and Dr. Papp. When I declare that all of these Hungarian Delegates are and have been thoroughgoing collaborators with Soviet communism, I assume the same to be true of their Czechoslovak brethren.

Mr. Speaker, if these individuals were free agents in any sense of the word, I would be among the first to welcome them to our shores. But they are not and cannot be free in any sense of the word. Either they must be devout, fanatical Marxists or they have close relatives in their homelands or they are exposed to some other form of pressure that must merely leave them as obedient automata in the propaganda service of the Communist governments who have risked exposing them to the Western World.

The Department of State cherishes the hope that their visit here may serve to strengthen the Czech and Hungarian Protestant churches in the face of Communist pressure. Just how naive can one be? Far from having any salutary effect upon the people of Czechoslovakia and Hungary, the knowledge that these servants of world Communism who masquerade as men of God are coming to this country to advocate cooperation between the churches of east Europe and those of the free world and to promote the new Communist line of cooperation can have only a crushing blow to the hopes of those millions of anti-Communists behind the Iron Curtain who look longingly to the free world for the day of their liberation.

Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege and honor to be a member of the so-called Kersten committee which the Congress authorized last year to investigate the question of the communization of the Baltic States. This year the committee is working diligently on the investigation of the communizing of other satellite nations of east Europe. The Hungarian phase of our hearings, for example, is scheduled to open in Washington on August 20.

All of our witnesses have spoken, many times from first-hand experience, about the persecution of all forms of or-

ganized religion behind the Iron Curtain. Such revelations have been of considerable value and, I feel, have been well worth the money appropriated by the Congress for this purpose. The State Department also has endorsed our findings. But now the same State Department is admitting these Communist delegates to our country on behalf of the cause of organized religion when the truth is that they speak for no one except those atheists who control the governments of their homelands.

Think of the field day that their presence here will give to the propagandists of world communism. Imagine what a Czech or Hungarian will believe when he learns that these arch collaborators have been welcomed by some of the highest religious leaders in our land, to say nothing of the possible participation of national figures from other walks of life.

Mr. Speaker, I say that the participation of these false churchmen in our religious conferences is a shame and an affront upon those other Czech and Hungarian religious heroes who attempted to oppose the Communists and who suffered imprisonment or worse as a result. I do not confine my remarks to the well-publicized cases of the high Roman Catholic prelates. There have been many Protestant martyrs as well. I mention the case of Bishop Lajos Ordas of the Hungarian Reformed Church who was imprisoned while I was in Hungary because he would not sell his services to the cause of world communism. When we admit men like Bereczky and Hrowadka as representatives of their churches to our shores, we sully the memory of those brave individuals who have suffered in defending the cause of religious freedom behind the Iron Curtain.

It has been suggested to me that the Conference of the World Council of Churches at Evanston may issue a sweeping denunciation of international communism. I hope that this may be done. But I understand that a report which has been prepared by a committee of Protestant theologians for submission to the conference criticizes both communism and democracy with equal fervor. In discussing the report, the New York Herald-Tribune in its June 15 issue said:

Democracy was accused of harboring inequality, injustice, discrimination and aggression and of "relying on naked power."

If this report should be adopted by the full conference, the Communist propagandists will know what to include and what to omit when they return home to "strengthen their churches" as the State Department puts it.

Mr. Speaker, the Communist connections of these Czech and Hungarian delegates are well known to and admitted by the State Department or there would have been no need for consultation with the Attorney General. Obviously, the Communists are only going to send delegates who are thoroughly reliable and who can be thoroughly controlled. The incredible naivete and persistent refusal to face realism on the part of the Department is most disheartening to one who, like myself, hoped far better things from the new regime.

When the Department hopes that spiritual contacts in this country might have a beneficial effect upon the Communist delegates and might make them more aware of their responsibilities to the peoples of their own countries, it is in effect destroying much of the work of combating Communist propaganda that our own organs, such as the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe, are carrying on. The State Department in recommending the admission of these delegates is hampering and sabotaging the work that so many of us are trying to do in exposing the real truth about international communism, the real truth about conditions behind the Iron Curtain, the real truth about the world menace we face today at home and abroad.

I am not crying "treason, treason" when I speak so. I am not accusing either the National Council of Churches of Christ, of which my own church is a member, or the State Department of being infiltrated with Communists who have engineered this accomplishment. But I do say that there are those in authority in both places who are blinded by their naivete, who stubbornly refuse to face the facts, who persist in an incomprehensible course of nonrealism. Those of whom I speak are persons, especially in the State Department, who should know better than to persist in this foolish attempt at peaceful coexistence and cooperation with international communism and its disciples. As our speaker said on July 9: "What possible chance is there for coexistence of this outlaw conspiracy alongside a civilization based on truth, trust, and faith, on freedom and the individual dignity of man?"

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, certain of my colleagues and I recently spoke in our minority report on the mutual security program of the need for this country to exercise a spiritual and a moral leadership worthy of a great heritage and a great people. I stand here before you and say that a compromise with evil which admits these Communist delegates to our shores in the name of organized religion, that such a compromise is an abnegation of that moral leadership which the entire anti-Communist world is looking to us to provide. And I say shame on any who have lent themselves to the practice of this betrayal.

REVOLUTION IN RUSSIA

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include additional matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, when a Russian diplomat or a Red spy is chosen to operate inside the free world, his loyalty to communism has met all the incredibly thorough checking of the Reds.

After 12 successful missions behind the Iron Curtain, author-lecturer John Morley said:

No one is approved for clearance outside Russia unless his record and credentials are checked and rechecked by one of the most secret departments of the Soviet Union.

And he concluded:

So when one of these "approved" Reds voluntarily escapes to the West, it's a sure sign that something critical is brewing behind the Iron Curtain.

Does this mean there are some weaknesses in the Soviet empire that may be exploited by the Free World for ultimate victory in the struggle against Communist aggression?

Very definitely—if there is substance to data filtering out by devious channels from behind the Iron Curtain which I am summarizing today. Naturally, it is impossible to recheck the sources of this information, and I do not certify its accuracy. My purpose is to lay it before you for your own evaluation.

However, important confirmation of much previously unsubstantiated intelligence was made in a dramatic fashion recently by one of these "approved" Red escapees. He is Nikolai Khokhlov, a former Soviet secret police agent.

Sent to West Berlin to murder an important foe of the Soviet regime, Khokhlov instead surrendered to his intended victim. On May 21 of this year Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER's International Security Subcommittee Investigating Soviet Assassination and Terrorism interviewed him.

Here in part, are his responses to questions by Senator JENNER and the subcommittee's chief counsel, Charles P. Grimes:

Mr. GRIMES. Now, it is true, is it not, that you have been an officer of the MGB for some 13 years?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. I was a collaborator, that is, a worker with the MGB, and the officer's rank I have had since 1950, since September 1950.

Mr. GRIMES. Now, what is the MGB and its predecessor, the NKVD, will you please explain?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. The MGB is a service which is engaged in the affairs of intelligence and counterintelligence. This service is engaged in sending agents abroad and in countering the activities of enemy agents.

When this organization exists alone, its name is MGB. When this organization is merged into a ministry of internal affairs, then its identity, or the name is lost, and it becomes a part of either MVD, or as it was NKVD.

Mr. GRIMES. NKVD was the original name?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. Before that, there was also another name, NKGB, which actually was the same.

Mr. GRIMES. Did you belong to any particular branch of the MGB?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. Yes.

Mr. GRIMES. What branch was that?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. During the war, the name of this service was the Fourth Administration. Then its official function was the partisan, that is the guerrilla warfare, with the Germans.

After the war, the name of this service was changed to the Bureau No. 1. It was stated officially that the purpose of this bureau was preparation for training for the future partisan warfare.

In 1953, this service once again was renamed, and this time it was known as the Ninth Section.

However, it is known to me for certain that the real purpose of this organization for all this period was diversionary activities and terroristic work for the Soviet benefit abroad.

Mr. GRIMES. Will you please describe what the terroristic activities abroad consisted of?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. In the official language of the MGB, official terminology of the MGB, the term "terroristic activities" means the implementation of directions dealing with the assassinations or murder of individual persons.

Mr. GRIMES. And what does the phrase "diversionary activities" mean as used by the Soviet Government and your agency and department?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. Diversionary activities include sabotage, organization of explosions, fires, in harbors and other installations, and the sabotage in plants, destruction of different types of war production, throwing bombs in various cities in order to create panic, this is basically all.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, I want to ask how extensive is this organization of MGB? In how many countries is it operated to your knowledge?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. This is a very extensive organization, and one could say it covers all countries.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to ask if they have an American desk, this terrorist organization?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. Yes, within this organization, there is a certain section which is engaged in work on America.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a member of the MGB?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. I am an officer of MGB.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you now?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. No; not since the moment of defection, I am not or have not been an officer.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you refuse to carry out an assignment to commit murder?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. Yes; I refused, I never performed the assignments to murder.

The CHAIRMAN. Why?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. Because I consider that the murder or assassination is a crime against religion and conscience.

Mr. GRIMES. Would you please state the events from the time that you received this assignment, where you received it, when you received it, and who gave you this assignment?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. I received an assignment on the organization for the assassination of Okolovich in the beginning of October 1953.

Mr. GRIMES. Who was Okolovich?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. One of the leaders of the emigre movement known as NTS.

The CHAIRMAN. What does NTS stand for?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. National Labor Work Alliance.

Mr. GRIMES. Is it really an alliance of workers, or is it something else?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. No; this alliance unites the most diversified strata of people.

Mr. GRIMES. Are they all emigres from Russia?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. Yes.

Mr. GRIMES. What is their purpose?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. To carry out a revolution in Russia and to replace the present regime with the one that would be more free.

Mr. GRIMES. Has this organization been in existence, to your knowledge, since the 1930's?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. Yes; approximately since that period.

Mr. GRIMES. Is it a large organization insofar as you know?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. Yes; it is a large organization.

Mr. GRIMES. What is the basis of your knowledge of this organization?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. The data that are in the possession of the MGB and the data that was given to me for my knowledge by my superiors.

Mr. GRIMES. And you had to study it intensively; did you not?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. Yes.

Mr. GRIMES. Mr. Khokhlov, you have testified about your assignment to head the assassination group of Mr. Okolovich and your study of the dossier of the NTS.

Did not the dossier presented to you as a preliminary step also contain a file on Okolovich himself?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. Yes, there was a special dossier on Okolovich in this file which gave detailed information covering all aspects of Okolovich's personal life to the extent which was known to Soviet Intelligence Service.

Mr. GRIMES. Did you learn from that file, or otherwise, of previous attempts made against Mr. Okolovich and Mrs. Okolovich?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. Yes, I knew the whole story, the complete story of attempts to assassinate Okolovich and also attempts to kidnap him.

Mr. GRIMES. Had there been an attempt to kidnap his wife also, do you know?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. No; they did not make any attempts to kidnap his wife. It was merely planned to kill her in case she interfered.

Mr. GRIMES. Not to kidnap; just to kill her if necessary; is that it?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. Yes, precisely.

Mr. GRIMES. Now, will you tell us, please, about this assignment, starting with when you first received word that this was to be your assignment?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. This assignment was given to me at first by my direct superior, Colonel Studnikov.

Mr. GRIMES. And who in turn was his superior?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. Panyushkin.

Mr. GRIMES. Panyushkin was the former Ambassador to the United States of America from Soviet Russia; is that correct?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. Yes; this is precisely so.

Mr. GRIMES. And you know that to be the same man who was our Ambassador here for some 5 years?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. Yes; this was the story mentioned within the ministry.

Mr. GRIMES. Now, what precisely was your assignment as given you by Studnikov?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. Studnikov told me that I am given an assignment to organize a liquidation of one of the most distinguished Russian emigres, who was the most dangerous enemy of the Soviet power.

I myself was categorically forbidden to assassinate him personally, inasmuch as I was the leader of this operation, the organization of the assassination. I was supposed to recruit two German agents to carry out the assassination. These men were to be selected from the personnel of the agents whom we had available in Eastern Germany.

Furthermore, I had to prepare the documents for them, to prepare the story for them, and order the weapons for them, and take steps to organize their trip to Frankfurt.

Furthermore, I was supposed to give them instructions as to how the plan should be implemented. I was supposed to give them instruction as to how approximately the deed had to be carried out.

For this purpose, several agents of Eastern Germany, and those who were in Western Germany, were given to me for my disposal. I had to send them to collect information and data on Okolovich and for taking pictures of the place of Okolovich's residence.

Such was the basic assignment in its main parts. As to the details, I had to work them out myself.

Mr. GRIMES. Now, in connection with that, were you given a file on the NTS to study?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. Yes; so that I would have the precise idea as to what this organization is.

Mr. GRIMES. Now based upon the file which you were given to study, in connection with this assassination assignment, what did you

discover as to the purposes and effectiveness of the NTS, the National Labor Alliance?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. On the basis of my study of the material that was in the file that was turned over to me, and on the basis of the so-called briefing which was issued on the 5th of November 1953, I could come to a conclusion that MGB, in this particular case, considers that the NTS is a very strong organization in carrying its fight against the Soviet Union.

Mr. GRIMES. According to that information, do they carry on their fight against the Soviet Union preliminarily, as you have testified, to an ultimate revolution?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. NTS has a large volume of propaganda literature, such as bulletins, individual sheets, newspapers, and books, which it disseminates in the territory of the Soviet Union and the countries of people's democracy.

Mr. GRIMES. Based upon your intelligence information, how do they get it into Russia?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. They have their own cells and that is small organizations within the ranks of the Soviet Army and in the Soviet Union. For liaison with these cells, the NTS sends a large number of couriers regularly who cross the frontier and go to both the territory of the Soviet Union and the territory of the so-called countries of people's democracy.

Mr. GRIMES. Does he mean the satellite countries?

Mr. SEREBRENNIKOV (the interpreter). Yes, of course.

Mr. GRIMES. Apart from the many couriers which you have testified crossed the Russian border in behalf of the NTS to bring propaganda leaflets and other items of propaganda in, do they use the method of balloons to convey propaganda messages into Russia and into their cells within Russia?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. This method has been written up in the newspapers, but this method was not a subject of the investigation on the part of the MGB.

The MGB was interested in the work of agents, and the data on the activities of the agents I had in great quantity.

Mr. GRIMES. Were some of the agents of the NTS who crossed the border and went into Soviet Russia apprehended?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. Yes, a certain number and a certain part, certain agents were tried officially; and other agents just perished without a trace behind the prison walls of the MGB.

Mr. GRIMES. What position did Okolovich occupy in the NTS?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. He was a leader of the so-called activities, which can also be translated as secret activities.

Mr. GRIMES. Will you describe the closed or secret activities?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. First of all, this work consisted of sending personnel, which means that first you had to select, to train them, and to train them in work, and to instill in them the spirit of the organization, and finally to brief them and to train them as to how they can accomplish the task with which they are charged.

Mr. GRIMES. To send the personnel into Russia itself, as well as the satellite countries?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. Yes; also into Russia itself.

Mr. GRIMES. In a sense he, then, was in charge of the secret police of the NTS operating in very much the same manner that your branch operated for the Soviet Government; is that not so?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. He was the head and the soul of all secret intelligence work directed against the Soviet Union.

Mr. GRIMES. In a sense he was a sort of an opposite number of Panyushkin?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. Only with the great difference in their purposes, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. Panyushkin was an assassin and Okolovich was a propagandist; is that correct?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. This is precisely so.

Mr. GRIMES. Is it a fact that the Soviet Government very much fears the operations of the NTS?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. This is an absolutely exact fact.

The CHAIRMAN. What they really fear is the fact that they, the NTS, are Russian emigres, who have turned against Russia?

Mr. KHOKHLOV. Yes, of course; this is the most fearful thing for them, because this is the movement of the Russian people.

As evidenced by Khokhlov's testimony, NTS is an alliance of anti-Communist individuals and organizations. Extremists, moderates, and conservatives are all welcomed into the common cause.

As a consequence, NTS sometimes has been the target of criticism for the crackpot views of some of its members on subjects unrelated to liberating the people of Russia from the Soviet regime. Unbiased observers indicate, however, that NTS sticks to this primary objective with a remarkable singleness of purpose. They likewise feel that its secondary objective, establishing a democratic government adapted to Russian conditions and needs, is safe from extremist influences.

NTS has a following on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Its ideological basis is said to be Christian morals and recognition of human individuality. However, it is revolutionary in character because, knowing the nature of the Communist regime, it believes that nothing short of a revolution will destroy it. The NTS also believes that nothing short of a revolution carried out by the victimized people themselves will expose the nature of communism to the world.

Its program of action is:

First. To reduce the idea of revolt to terms generally understood and accepted by the people.

Second. To instruct the people how to fight; to develop leaders; and to speed up the formation of a revolutionary atmosphere.

Third. When the time is ripe, to overthrow the Reds and to substitute a democratic government.

To carry out this task, NTS has developed and put into practice a strategic plan adapted to conditions in a totalitarian state. It seeks to train and build a strong body of devoted and experienced revolutionary leaders to spearhead the revolt.

By various methods of underground propaganda the "molecular theory" of revolt described by Khokhlov is carried out. Individuals are encouraged to enroll in an organization, the members of which are unknown to each other except for cells or molecules of 2 or 3 trusted friends. One member only of each cell is known to one member only of another cell. As indicated by the testimony, to attain common aims and act uniformly, NTS couriers are in constant touch with these cells, passing along carefully planned instructions from revolutionary headquarters.

Aside from minor acts of defiance which can be carried on without too much risk, the present major effort by

these cells is the enlistment of like-minded, trustworthy individuals into new cells. The effort is stimulated by tracing symbols and slogans of the NTS on walls, railroad cars, and the like. In this manner individuals predisposed to throw off the Red regime are made aware that they are not alone. Moreover, the sight of such signs proves to the citizen that an act of defiance against the Government was committed with impunity. He realizes that anyone who takes elementary precautions can do the same without much risk of detection.

Since these symbols express a particular set of ideas and political principles, their constant appearance helps to organize thought and unite people into a coordinated effort. By the surreptitious tracing of an NTS symbol, the individual is actually voting not only against the regime, but for a determined and positive purpose.

NTS believes it is creating inside Russia a new and growing political force over which the Government has no control. The growth of such a force, they say, will instill a growing feeling of insecurity in the ranks of Government supporters and reduce their efficiency. Thus a double-pronged process of strengthening the resistance through united revolutionary thinking and weakening the Government's dictatorial power of oppression by demoralizing its machinery is underway.

NTS sees three basic stages in the process of revolution against the Kremlin:

The first, longest, and least conspicuous stage is the formation of these many, coordinated cells.

The second is a transitional period in which the development of cells is advanced enough to stir up some to open outbursts against the Government, but inadequate to support a general revolt. NTS expects these outbursts to be suppressed, but hopes such evidences of popular opposition will hurt the morale of the police organization which is supposed to control them. As these outbursts grow in scope and violence, the repressive measures of the police are expected to become less and less decisive.

The third and final stage of general revolt will come when the country is ripe for a planned and organized general uprising.

This analysis by the NTS is based on the existing situation in Russia. Such a contingency as war would introduce entirely new factors calling for an entirely new strategy.

There are some who believe events behind the Iron Curtain already have proceeded to the second, or transitional, stage. As outward signs of rising populace resistance they cite (a) the reluctance, and sometimes absolute refusal, of Soviet troops to take repressive measures during the East German uprisings in June, last year; (b) workers' strikes at heavy industry centers in Russia; (c) strikes, riots, and stubborn resistance to the MVD by inmates in a number of Soviet concentration camps; (d) subversive activity by students' political organizations in Moscow, Leningrad, and other large centers. Arrests were so many, and rumors so widespread, that

the Kremlin had to break its curtain of silence and publish reports about them in its own newspapers, thereby acknowledging the existence of active anti-communism amongst the younger generation.

Stalin's death and the fall of Beria, it is claimed, seriously undermined the hypnotic power of Soviet propaganda myths. The myths of the indestructible unity of Stalin's loyal disciples of the invincibility of the MVD; and many others were exposed in all their absurdity. People began to realize that the monsters of the Kremlin and their MVD henchmen are but ordinary mortals after all.

The struggle for power between Malenkov, Beria, and others following Stalin's death, and still going on, is having its debilitating effect on the Red machinery of government another way, too. For it places every Red official in a tough spot. Big or little, he is constantly worried as to how he should behave in order to avoid suspicion and eventual vengeance from one of the rival factions.

Trained to demonstrate his loyalty through servility to his seniors and glorification of the supreme leader, he is at a loss how to meet the new situation. He knows what would happen if he glorifies a loser. Thus the Soviet official is no longer as efficient a servant of the regime as he used to be. His main preoccupation is to survive.

The plight of members of the MGB-MVD secret police organizations is even worse than that of the ordinary Soviet official. The purge of pro-Beria elements continues. Old hands, according to word from behind the Iron Curtain, prefer to play it safe. They refuse to use their initiative and imagination. Agents newly recruited to replace purged pro-Beria elements are generally inferior in quality and lack training and experience. Their work is crude and unreliable.

Exposure to anti-Communist literature, which it is their duty to collect, study, and criticize, also affects MVD and MGB men. It is interesting to note that Nikolai Khokhlov's tremendous respect for the NTS came almost entirely from his reading of the MGB dossiers on the organization. This general weakening of morale based on personal insecurity may help explain the unprecedented trek of MVD and MGB deserters to the West.

Conscious both of this increasing hostility from the population and a weakening in its police apparatus, the Kremlin recently embarked on a policy of concessions. Since totalitarian governments cannot go far along the path of reform, the effort backfired.

Soviet farmers began to spend more time in their own backyards and worry less about deliveries to the state. Soviet workers, disappointed with what they got, in many cases struck for more and actually got it because the MVD could not overcome their resistance. Amnesty to a few of the millions held prisoner by the Reds encouraged a general demand from concentration-camp prisoners for additional concessions, which again, the MVD proved powerless to deal with except by mass executions.

German prisoners of war who recently completed sentences at some of these camps report that the strikers even hoped the Americans would parachute weapons to them. Although the concentration camps submitted to force, these returned prisoners of war say the prisoners' resistance spirit has not been broken.

NTS appears to be highly encouraged by these events and claims a healthy share of the credit for bringing them about. Based on what it feels it has so far accomplished, NTS is making strenuous efforts to engage as many more individuals in its organization as possible. It seeks not only to draw civilians in its efforts, but boldly claims success in establishing revolutionary cells in the Red Army itself.

Since success or failure of an eventual open revolt depends on the quality of available leaders, NTS is said to direct much effort toward building up a large force of experienced revolutionary leaders and deploying them in strategical positions.

These elements are strictly forbidden to engage in any activities which could lead to premature disclosure of their anti-Communist connections. To reduce the danger of their exposure through betrayal they are isolated from contact with other NTS elements behind the Iron Curtain.

Khokhlov brought with him to the Jenner committee hearings two sample NTS propaganda pieces which were introduced into the record. One was a facsimile of a 100-ruble banknote on one side to attract attention to the anti-Soviet literature on the other side. The second was a handkerchief with a message printed on one side. They show the devious and various means NTS uses to spread its revolution propaganda behind the Iron Curtain.

If NTS claims are true, its printed propaganda barrage is a major effort indeed. Distribution of 9,693,350 propaganda pieces is claimed during 1951, another 11,220,000 pieces during 1952, and 17,847,130 during 1953.

Some of the propaganda pieces are in ordinary, undisguised leaflet form, as distinguished from the samples of disguised literature handed over by Khokhlov. They all contain basic information relating to the aims, nature, strategy, and tactics of the NTS. Two underground newspapers are of a similar nature.

Brochures and books dealing with ideological, political, and tactical problems and stories on revolutionary themes are bound inside innocent Soviet books, or in the covers of Soviet books. Facsimiles of major Soviet newspapers and magazines, railroad timetables, and similar publications containing concentrated or scattered propaganda material also are used.

Not only are such propaganda materials delivered by hand, dropped in public places, and otherwise manually distributed, but a number of mechanical devices and even balloons and rockets are used to gain wider clandestine distribution and protect individual NTS personnel from unnecessary risk.

As another means of spreading its views, NTS operates a mobile clandestine radio station known as Radio Free Russia. It operates mainly on Soviet shortwave frequencies.

Unlike the Voice of America, it is not inhibited by any diplomatic considerations. The station tries to transmit eight half-hour programs every day. Apart from such regular programs, the station interferes with Soviet radio programs and butts in on radio conversations between pilots of Red planes as they patrol over Germany.

During maneuvers tank crews can listen to it quite freely, and Radio Free Russia obligingly increases the number of its "wild" programs for their special benefit.

Deserters from the Red army claim the programs are very effective because it is the only radio station that teaches the soldier what he has to do and how he has to act to protect himself from the MVD.

The station is, of course, subject to Soviet jamming, but it changes frequencies every 5 to 7 minutes, asking listeners to try to relocate it by tuning. When it broadcasts on Soviet wavelengths, its main objective is to throw in a slogan or a caustic remark during pauses in Soviet programs whenever it has a chance.

Not overlooking any possibilities to ridicule the Soviet Government in the eyes of its slaves, NTS engages in a running battle of wits with the MVD. One of its most successful capers was pulled off when the Soviet Government purchased a large well-advertised shipment of oranges from Italy.

Underground agents of the NTS operating in Italy succeeded in placing artistically made imitation oranges containing propaganda leaflets in a number of the crates.

When the oranges were unloaded in Russia and prepared for delivery to retailers, the MVD was informed of the trick.

It immediately had all the crates opened and every orange cut in half. It had the satisfaction of fishing out every single leaflet, but the population, instead of long-advertised oranges, received small quantities of juice. A few grumbled, but the majority chuckled. Rumors travel rapidly in a country where all news is censored.

If only a small part of the "cloak and dagger" story I have related is true, there still remains ample evidence that revolutionary processes are developing in the Soviet world.

These processes are a natural consequence of the ideological, political, social, and economic bankruptcy of the Communist regime. Their development was inevitable; the call of freedom is in the heart of every enslaved person and it is irresistible.

In short, this is the great weakness of the Soviet regime that can be exploited by the free world to gain ultimate, final victory over Communist world aggression.

Victory will not come easy, nor is it likely to come as quickly as many would like. The Soviet Government is still very strong and tenacious. It will fight

tooth and nail for survival. But there is hardly anything the Kremlin can do internally to win the real support of the oppressed population.

On the other hand, many things can be done to encourage that populations' active resistance to the regime. The dissemination of truth from the free world through the Iron Curtain to these people is basically no more than a technical problem which can be solved by funds, equipment, and courage.

One of the most basic and important truths that we must convey to these people is that we of the free world have no quarrel with the Soviet people themselves—that our only objective is to free them from the tyranny that enslaves them and now threatens destruction of our own freedoms.

There is but one conclusion to be reached from what I have placed before you:

Under present circumstances, we can gain victory over Communist world aggression; we can gain that victory without war; but only by channeling our most effective physical and moral support to expand the forces behind the Iron Curtain dedicated to the destruction of the Soviet regime from within.

APPROPRIATIONS PROVIDE SOUND FARM PROGRAM—SOIL CONSERVATION AND RESEARCH EMPHASIZED

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, this Congress, under the lead of President Eisenhower, has done and is doing a job which will be approved by almost all farmers in south Jersey.

The House passed the farm bill, which marks the beginning of a flexible-support program, and the end, I hope, of the rigid program which has done great disservice to agriculture generally, and to our farmers in particular.

I shall not here repeat the statement that I made to the House on July 1 in support of the amendment to start flexible supports, and stop rigid supports, except to emphasize two paragraphs of that speech. I then said:

There are many thousands of farmers who, of course, are directly benefited by this apparently eternal guaranty of prosperity, but what is overlooked is the fact that there are also many thousands of farmers who are not benefited at all. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESLTON] has called to your attention the situation with respect to New England farmers. I call your attention to the fact that the so-called basic commodities in my State of New Jersey which benefit from the present program of high, rigid price supports represent 2 percent of the total cash receipts of farmers in our State.

Of equal significance is that fact that our poultry, egg, and dairy farmers, who together represent 64 percent of the cash receipts in New Jersey, are not only not benefited, but are adversely affected by this program. The eggs that are sold in my district—one of the greatest egg-producing areas in this country—have to seek their support in the market place, while the grains that my egg producers have to buy are rigidly supported by artificially high prices.

The New Jersey Taxpayers Association has urged my help to move Government away from rigid 90 percent support program and

the tremendous waste it has built up in unmanageable surpluses.

I wish there was time to quote in full the analysis of this serious and growing problem which has been reported by the Council of State Chambers of Commerce.

The worst part of this rigid support program and the resultant pileup of farm surpluses is that, if it is continued, it will react most seriously against the farmer himself. The time will come when the American taxpayer and the American consumer will no longer tolerate a tax burden and the cost-of-living burden which is imposed by a program which was essentially an incentive for wartime production, and not a perpetual guaranty of profits for the huge wheat, corn, and cotton farmers at the expense of all the rest of us.

I am convinced that the continuance of the 90 percent rigid program is bad for the Nation, and worse for the farmers and people of New Jersey, and I regret that it has been found wise even to compromise the issue. It should be met head-on, and we should revert, after too long a delay, to the flexible program which the Congress adopted 3 years ago.

I propose, therefore, to support the compromise embodied in the Harrison amendment with a little bit of reluctance. I would prefer to meet the issue directly, but I must remember that compromise is often the essence of reasonable legislation.

That compromise passed, and I hope the Senate will come up soon with a bill as good or better.

AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS

Today, however, I want to speak of another great help to our local farmers, and that is the wise and generous action of the Appropriations Committee and the Congress in dealing with money needed for a sound program of aid to agriculture.

On March 10, I had the privilege of testifying before the House Committee on Agriculture Appropriations. I presented to them the views as I understand them, of our local farmers and farm organizations. I was received with great courtesy and consideration by the committee, which approved our views.

Among other things, I protested the proposed reduction in field area offices. A part of my discussion with the chairman follows:

Mr. HAND. The third point that he makes is, and I think possibly this might be almost the most important, the proposed reduction in field area offices.

Mr. ANDERSEN. You are correct. It is the most important.

Mr. HAND. As I understand it, the proposal is to reduce the authorization from 326 to 236.

Mr. ANDERSEN. Furthermore, the proposal is to increase the workload of each area office, Mr. HAND, from about 10 district units to 14. Many of us feel that that will be too heavy a load.

Mr. HAND. Yes, too heavy a load, and of course it does not effect too much saving. You might save some rent but I do not think you save too much staff if you are going to increase the staff.

Mr. ANDERSEN. As you know, in any of these programs you can spread supervision so thin that it becomes ineffective.

Mr. HAND. That is one of the problems we are facing in my own area right now. The supervision is good but it is spread too thin to be effective and we do not get the services of the experts that are sent down as much as we should. So that they have a grave question about that. They make the point

that there has been in the past a considerable reduction in these field offices and they think it has been reduced about as much as it should be in order to continue with effective service.

Mr. ANDERSEN. Just to complete the record, I might say that the budget before us, Mr. HAND, does not contain sufficient money to staff these new soil-conservation districts which are to be brought into being in the next fiscal year. Now, we think that is a mistake. We cannot expect the other soil-conservation districts to continually loan their manpower to the job in these new districts.

Mr. HAND. From my limited knowledge, let me say I am in complete agreement with the chairman because it is on the level where the work is actually done that we must be careful to continue the work. That is correct.

I discussed other phases of our problems, including forestry service.

I presented to the committee the statements of Dean Martin, of Rutgers, with respect to Federal support for research and extension work in New Jersey.

I concluded with this observation:

Mr. HAND. I want to add for the record very briefly that in the last 15 to 20 years, and perhaps I could limit it by saying the last 8 or 10 years, there has been an enormous change in agriculture in my area, and it has been a change for the better. Production has been greatly increased. Farm practices have been greatly improved. I think to a large degree that has happened as a result of the work of the Soil Conservation Service, and my people there are for it. They have taken advantage of it, and they want to continue to take advantage of it. Farms have been transformed from marginal farms that were making bare livings in many cases for the individual farmer, to farms that now, though still small farms, family farms, largely, nevertheless have been transformed into great producers and producers of cash crops; largely for quick-freezing process. There has been a very gratifying increase in the prosperity of the farmer and in the practices that he has been using, and the increase in production is something which I feel very strongly ought to be assisted and encouraged by our farm program.

Congressman MARSHALL, of Minnesota, was good enough to say this:

Mr. MARSHALL. I would like to say that I had the opportunity of visiting Mr. HAND's district last year with the Agriculture Committee and I saw some farm practices carried on in your district that I thought were fine examples of conservation. I was taken with some of the farming practices I saw in your district.

To sum up, the committee and the Congress passed an appropriation bill which I think is the most satisfactory bill for south Jersey that we have had.

EGGS

On this date—July 20—our great egg-producing area is suffering from a very unfavorable egg-feed ratio. Prices of eggs are low, and feed is high. This is partly caused by the rigid supports for wheat and corn which we are going to correct.

Production of eggs and poultry, vegetables and fruits, are basic to our whole south Jersey economy. Eggs are probably the biggest cash crop in our State, running last year to \$130 million. I have thus been greatly concerned with the present conditions in the egg market, which I hope will soon improve, as our Department of Agriculture believes,

Not long ago I visited with a committee of producers in Vineland, who felt that the best immediate remedy would be the introduction to our markets of surplus feeds from Commodity Credit Corporation.

Accordingly, after further discussions, which included other Congressmen whose districts were affected, and with Chairman HOPE, of the House Agriculture Committee, I had a long and pleasant conference with J. A. McConnell, the Administrator of the Commodity Stabilization Service. I found him fully informed on our problems and completely sympathetic. He himself is the operator of a 7,000-bird farm.

I asked him to put in writing his present views on what has been done, is being done, and can be done to be helpful. He promptly did so, and his statement follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
COMMODITY STABILIZATION SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., July 15, 1954.

Hon. T. MILLET HAND,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAND: Yesterday you called my attention to the difficulties being encountered by the poultrymen in your area due to the low price of eggs and the high cost of operations, including feed. I am quite aware of the facts which you set forth.

There is a belief on the part of the poultrymen that the high cost of feed is associated with the Government acquiring great stocks of feed grains under the support program. Since the storage facilities of the country are bulging with grain it seems to poultrymen, who have no support, that we should find some way to release grains to relieve this high-cost feed situation.

I have before me figures showing that on July 10 the value of a case of eggs over feed costs is \$2.95. A year ago it was \$7.58. The beginning and the end of the present situation is contained in these figures. Under favorable egg prices, poultrymen of the Nation expanded production. It was inevitable that some adjustment would have to come about through lower-priced eggs. This is occurring. The feed ratio has been even more unfavorable than the present during the past few weeks.

It has been obvious for some time that this condition was going to come about. The Department has to the extent possible in its disposal program, tried to recognize this situation and tried to help it as far as possible within the law. For instance: (1) We had great surpluses of dried milk fit for human consumption. We have put on a disposal program running to August 31 of this year which makes this highly desirable feed product available to the poultry and animal industry. (2) We are disposing of about 170 million bushels of 1948 and 1949 corn stored in Government warehouses, mostly in the Midwest. It is true that this particular corn might not get to the eastern seaboard but it certainly had the effect of keeping the price of corn stable at around present levels. Stocks of corn in the free market would have otherwise been very scarce.

One of the reasons for the very high price of poultry rations was the very short crop of soy beans last year, plus the heavy exports which took place. This resulted in soy-bean meal, a main product in poultry rations, going to very high prices. The release of the dried milk knocked the price of soy-bean meal down about \$20 per ton and has pretty well stabilized it so far. There is still plenty of dried milk that can be used until August 31.

We have also sold into the domestic market off-grade wheat supplies for feed purposes which have amounted to a very considerable amount.

I realize that all this does not help the poultrymen at the present moment, except that the condition would have been much worse if we had not done it. I know of no legal way in which we can divert Government stocks of grain into any particular area or even to the whole country under the present law unless those stocks can be declared out of condition. So far we have declared out of condition everything that can be properly classified as such. I am earnestly looking to see if there is anything more that can be done here on the east coast, but I am afraid that I can hold out very little hope in this direction.

In the meantime, there are some things which are hopeful. It looks like a bumper soy-bean crop is in prospect of being grown. With a plentiful crop and lower support prices, it should result in very much lower priced protein supplements. We also have bumper crops of all the feed grains. I can't see but what there will be considerable effect on feed prices this fall—probably within the next 45 to 60 days.

There is also every indication that the egg price will improve somewhat from this present level. Six to eight cents a dozen would give quite a different aspect to this situation.

If I can find anything more we can do within the law, I will advise you.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. McCONNELL,
Administrator.

Mr. Speaker, if there is not a healthy adjustment—and I hope there will be—we shall have to deal vigorously with this problem.

FARM PROSPERITY A MUST

Given good weather conditions from now on in, our farmers generally should have a good year. It is essential to the prosperity of all of us that farm income should be reasonably stable.

I am satisfied, however, that so far as legislation is concerned, this Congress has done a good job, which will prove to be of real benefit.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have until midnight tonight to file a report on S. 3458.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF OFFICERS OF THE REGULAR NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6725) to reenact the authority for the appointment of certain officers of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2432)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6725) to reenact the authority for the appointment of certain officers of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1 and 2.

L. C. ARENDS,
PAUL W. SHAFER,
LEROY JOHNSON,
JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
CARL VINSON,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
L. MENDEL RIVERS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
FRANCIS CASE,
JAMES H. DUFF,
JOHN C. STENNIS,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6725) to extend the authority for the appointment of certain officers in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The first section of the Senate amendment would have empowered the Board for the Correction of Naval Records to review the case of nonpromotion of any officer holding the rank of commander in the Regular Navy, active or retired, or lieutenant colonel in the Regular Marine Corps, active or retired, that occurred under the wartime panel system of promotion in the Regular Navy or Regular Marine Corps between January 1, 1942, and August 7, 1947, inclusive, and to recommend appropriate advancement in grade or rank if there was in the opinion of the Board, any error, administrative delay, oversight, or injustice that caused the officer concerned to fail of an advancement in grade or rank which would otherwise have been made. The officer concerned would have been required to request such a review within 6 months of the date of approval of the act. In the case of an officer below the grade of commander or lieutenant colonel, the Board for the Correction of Naval Records, or such other appropriate board or boards as may have been appointed or designated by the Secretary of the Navy would have been authorized to function in the same manner and for the same purposes as in the case of commanders or lieutenant colonels. The President would have been authorized to submit to the Senate the name of any officer recommended by the Board for promotion to a higher grade while any advancement within grade recommended by the Board would have been effected forthwith by the Secretary of the Navy. No advancements to grades higher than captain or colonel were authorized. The pay and allowances of an officer who was advanced would have been based upon the grade or rank to which advanced and would have been computed from the date when he would have been advanced in normal course but for the error, administrative delay, oversight, or injustice which caused him to fail of advancement.

Section 2 of the amendment, in effect, would have authorized the promotion to the grade of captain of two retired commanders,

United States Navy, who met either of two detailed sets of qualifications, and would have given them, retroactively, pay and allowances based on the grade of captain, computed from the date the officers next junior to them were promoted to captain.

The Senate receded from its amendment to the House bill.

The House managers were of the opinion that the Senate amendment, if enacted into law, would establish a precedent which might well impugn the integrity of the entire Navy and Marine Corps promotion system. While the amendment applied only to the panel system which operated during World War II, it might well be used as a basis for seeking similar reviews for officers who have failed or will fail of selection under the 1947 Officer Personnel Act.

The amendment would also have automatically promoted two officers who failed of promotion during World War II.

The House managers can find no present justification for the enactment of legislation which by its terms would result in the automatic promotion of two officers to the grade of captain with pay retroactive to the date that officers junior to them were promoted to the grade of captain. Such action would of course establish a precedent for many similar bills thus creating a review system in the Congress which could only have the effect of undermining the objectivity and finality of the promotion systems established for each of the armed services. To overcome this objection, there must be clear, undisputed evidence of substantial error and injustice.

L. C. ARENDS,
PAUL W. SHAFER,
LEROY JOHNSON,
JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
CARL VINSON,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
L. MENDEL RIVERS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. REED of New York and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENKINS and to include additional matter.

Mr. SIEMINSKI in three instances.

Mr. SHELLEY in three instances and to include with his remarks certain additional matter.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland.

Mr. PRICE.

Mr. YORTY.

Mr. HESELTON to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LIPSCOMB.

Mr. DONOHUE and to include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles,

which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4854. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the irrigation works comprising the Foster Creek division of the Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington;

H. R. 6725. An act to reenact the authority for the appointment of certain officers of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps;

H. R. 6788. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and local agencies in the planning and carrying out of works of improvement for soil conservation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7434. An act to establish a National Advisory Committee on Education;

H. R. 7601. An act to provide for a White House Conference on Education;

H. R. 8571. An act to authorize the construction of naval vessels, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9040. An act to authorize cooperative research in education; and

H. J. Res. 534. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built passenger-cargo vessels, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 252. An act to permit all civil actions against the United States for recovery of taxes erroneously or illegally assessed or collected to be brought in the district courts with right of trial by jury;

S. 2380. An act to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended;

S. 2381. An act to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended, in order to promote the development of oil and gas on the public domain; and

S. 2759. An act to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act so as to promote and assist in the extension and improvement of vocational rehabilitation services, provide for a more effective use of available Federal funds, and otherwise improve the provisions of that act, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 23, 1954, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1761. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of May 1954, pursuant to Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1762. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of the number of professors and instructors and the amount of compensation for each employed by the United States Naval Postgraduate School during the fiscal year 1954, pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 303, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1763. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Fair Labor

Standards Act of 1938, as amended"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1764. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on audit of Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1951 and 1952, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JACKSON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report pursuant to House Resolution 113 pertaining to Latin American technical cooperation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2442). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5301. A bill to amend and supplement the reclamation laws to provide for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2443). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HINSHAW: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 541. An act to extend detention benefits under the War Claims Act of 1948 to employees of contractors with the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 2444). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 660. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 7840, a bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 2445). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 661. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 9434, a bill to amend section 216 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for the maintenance of the Merchant Marine Academy; without amendment (Rept. No. 2446). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 662. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 9924, a bill to provide for family quarters for personnel of the military departments of the Department of Defense and their dependents, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2447). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TOLLEFSON: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 9115. A bill to provide that contributions received under Public Law 485, 80th Congress, for the construction of a merchant marine chapel shall be invested in Government obligations pending their use for such construction; without amendment (Rept. No. 2448). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TOLLEFSON: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 9584. A bill to protect the rights of vessels of the United States on the high seas and in territorial waters of foreign countries; without amendment (Rept. No. 2449). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TOLLEFSON: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 9987. A bill to amend certain provisions of title XI of the

Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to facilitate private financing of new ship construction, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2450). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HINSHAW: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 2420. An act to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 2451). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Committee on Government Operations. H. R. 9406. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the town of Beaufort, N. C.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2452). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 10009. A bill to provide for the review of customs tariff schedules, to improve procedures for the tariff classification of unenumerated articles, to repeal or amend obsolete provisions of the customs laws, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2453). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REES of Kansas: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 2665. An act to amend the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2454). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:
H. R. 9997. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that the value of imported hops shall be computed, for purposes of determining the applicable rate of duty thereon, as of the date of purchase; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATES:
H. R. 9998. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the duties applicable to certain prepared fish; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEAMER:
H. R. 9999. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act to provide that the annuity of the widow of a deceased employee shall not be reduced on account of any benefits to which she may be entitled under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:
H. R. 10000. A bill to amend section 284 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to representational activities of former employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:
H. R. 10001. A bill to change the name of the Fort Randall Reservoir in the State of South Dakota to "Lake Evans"; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 10002. A bill to provide for the erection of a monument to Chief Red Cloud on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DONOHUE:
H. R. 10003. A bill granting the consent of Congress to certain New England States to enter into a compact relating to higher education in the New England States and establishing the New England Board of Higher Education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 10004. A bill to provide for emergency Federal financial assistance to the States

and Territories in the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities urgently needed because of overcrowding, and to encourage full and efficient use of State and local resources in meeting school construction needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:
H. R. 10005. A bill to amend section 112 (b) (7) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to the making and filing of elections; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENKINS:
H. R. 10006. A bill to amend section 421 (d) (1) (D) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:
H. R. 10007. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to prescribe regulations relating to the qualifications of persons who assist taxpayers in the determination of their Federal tax liability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:
H. R. 10008. A bill to provide that checks for benefits provided by laws administered by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may be forwarded to the addressee in certain cases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:
H. R. 10009. A bill to provide for the review of customs tariff schedules, to improve procedures for the tariff classification of unenumerated articles, to repeal or amend obsolete provisions of the customs laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARMATZ:
H. R. 10010. A bill to amend title 9, United States Code, entitled "Arbitration," so as to provide for correction of defects and omissions in the present law regulating arbitration, for judicial review of questions of law arising in arbitration proceedings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:
H. R. 10011. A bill to amend section 112 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the sale of cattle necessitated by drought conditions shall be deemed an involuntary conversion of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEILL:
H. R. 10012. A bill to amend section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, so as to provide that all quota numbers not used in any year shall be made available to immigrants in oversubscribed areas in the following year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10013. A bill to admit 50,000 immigrants, natives and citizens of Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:
H. R. 10014. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 with respect to deductions from gross income of amounts contributed to employees trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUDGE:
H. J. Res. 567. Joint resolution establishing a joint congressional committee to study yield insurance programs for certain agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:
H. Con. Res. 261. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the control of atomic energy and its derivatives; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:
H. Res. 663. Resolution to affirm the American people's opposition to the Communist enslavement of Poland and other captive nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 10015. A bill for the relief of Nicola Teodosio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 10016. A bill for the relief of Edward L. Raymond; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H. R. 10017. A bill for the relief of William T. Dorminy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 10018. A bill for the relief of Hon-orato Carlos Dizon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10019. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Goodall; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 10020. A bill for the relief of Sister M. Conleith, Ellen Agnes Cousins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 10021. A bill for the relief of Zeynep Hesna Turkkan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 10022. A bill for the relief of Armando Alfaro-Arciniega; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 10023. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lina Gemora Ray; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10024. A bill for the relief of Salvador Guillermo Chofre, Mercedes Viray Chofre and Miguel Jesus Chofre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10025. A bill for the relief of Pablo Ruiz de Alda, Maria Dolores Gomez Ruiz de Alda, Ana Maria Ruiz de Alda, and Antonio Ruiz de Alda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 10026. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Esther Reed Marcantel to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON (by request):

H. R. 10027. A bill to authorize the President to place Paul A. Smith, a commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, on the retired list, in the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, at the time of his retirement, with entitlement to all benefits pertaining to any officer retired in such grade; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

1113. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the president, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Wausau, Wis., urging the clarification and satisfactory amending of the bills H. R. 9757 and S. 3690, which was referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Need for Government Support for Merchant Marine and Shipbuilding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 1954

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, debate on the Wigglesworth amendment to the supplemental appropriation bill which passed the House on July 20 showed that there is a great lack of understanding on the part of many Members of the House regarding the basic facts about the American maritime industry. The debate also showed a lack of knowledge concerning the laws which Congress has passed to give support to our merchant marine and our shipbuilding industry, and the reasons why those laws are necessary from a purely selfish standpoint—selfish on the part of the American people as distinguished from the maritime industry itself. The ignorance which was displayed on the floor of the House while we debated the wisdom of putting shipbuilding funds back in the bill would be pardonable in the average American. But it seems to me that those who are legislating on these matters in appropriations bills, if they are not content to accept the judgment of the House committees having jurisdiction, should be more familiar with the problems with which they are dealing and with the history and purpose of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 in providing at least a partial solution to those problems. The frequent references to "boondoggling" which we heard applied to the vital Government supported shipbuilding program prove that this familiarity is lacking. For that reason I have decided to insert in the RECORD a series of remarks reviewing certain phases of our shipbuilding history and intended to show

that the dollars we appropriate to build ships are far from wasted, but are actually a sound and necessary investment for the Government and for the American people. I trust that the points I bring out will have educational value, will perhaps persuade some of my colleagues that when similar requests for funds are brought to the House in the future they should think twice before opposing them.

Typical of the many loose statements we have heard in the debate on the supplemental appropriation bill, Mr. Speaker, was the remark that neither the A. F. of L. or the CIO supported these shipbuilding fund requests. I know personally that nothing could be further from the truth and that the major unions from both organizations whose members are employed in the shipyards or related fields have consistently supported these appropriations and have reiterated that position in connection with the bill we just amended. In fact, President Meany, of the A. F. of L., and President Reuther, of the CIO, have asked for the program in addition to the shipyard unions.

The ship construction differential subsidy provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 were enacted for the very sound reason that the experience of many years had proved beyond doubt that the American shipping industry by itself could not afford to have ships built in American shipyards, in competition with low-cost foreign yards. We had spent \$2½ billion during the World War I period in a hurried and confused effort to rebuild a shipbuilding industry which had been allowed to die in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Despite that \$2½ billion we were unable to get any new vessels off the ways in time to help win that war—concrete proof that the few millions we are asked to spend now to preserve the industry are not wasted. With a large fleet of vessels on our hands after World War I, the tardy product of the war effort, it was not until the thirties that the growing obsolescence of

that fleet forced a hard look at our entire maritime industry on the part of Congress, although some legislative attempts had been made in the meantime to encourage private construction of ships with little result. The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was the result of several years of study by congressional committees. Results since that time have proved its value beyond question, especially in that, although the shipbuilding program it provided hardly had time to get under way before World War II was upon us, by the date of Pearl Harbor the subsidized shipping lines had 146 vessels built or building under its provisions which were quickly requisitioned by the Government. The so-called Harvard report prepared in 1945 for the United States Navy and the Maritime Commission stated:

Because of the 1936 Merchant Marine Act, the United States had both a nucleus of modern merchant vessels before the disaster at Pearl Harbor in December 1941 and the machinery for greatly expanding ship production to meet the extraordinary requirements of World War II.

So this "boondoggling," as we have heard it called, was a major instrument in preventing a far greater disaster than Pearl Harbor—the possible loss of the war for lack of shipping in its early stages. Twelve billion dollars was spent by the United States Government during the war for construction of commercial-type vessels, and for putting up and restoring the shipyards in which to build them. We not only had to build ships in a hurry, but because of our improvidence in between wars many of our existing shipyards were in such a state of decay that they could not be quickly rehabilitated, and we had to funnel hundreds of millions of dollars into creating new yards on all coasts and on the Great Lakes to get ship construction going in the fastest possible time. Had our shipyards been more active during the pre-war years, and had we spent a little money to keep more of the yards on